REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 460 SP 001 358

REPORTS ON "TEACH," TEACHER EDUCATION FOR ADVANCING THE CULTURALLY HANDICAPPED. SECONDARY TEACHER PREPARATION.
BY- HANNA, LYLE AND OTHERS
CALIFORNIA STATE COLL., LOS ANGELES, SCH. OF EDUC.
PUB DATE JAN 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.12 101P.

DESCRIPTORS- BIBLIOGRAPHIES, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *CURRICULUM EVALUATION, CURRICULUM PLANNING, DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, INNOVATION, METHODS COURSES, ON SITE COURSES, SECONDARY EDUCATION, *SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER PLACEMENT, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, PROJECT TEACH, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE AT LOS ANGELES,

PROJECT "TEACH" WAS ESTABLISHED TO IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED. IN THE AREA OF SECONDARY EDUCATION, SEVERAL GOALS WERE SET AND MET. (1) PROFESSORS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION WERE ASSISTED IN CHANGING CURRICULUM AND INCREASING THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE CULTURE OF POVERTY BY INSTITUTING ON-SITE COURSES IN METHODS AND THEORIES AND BY DRAWING ON NEW MATERIALS AND ACADEMIC AREA FACULTY MEMBERS. (2) THE PROJECT HAS DIRECTLY AIDED THE INNER-CITY SCHOOLS BY PARTICIPATING IN NDEA INSTITUTES AND PROVIDING THEM WITH A NEW SOURCE OF QUALITY TEACHERS. (3) THE PROJECT, BASED ON INFORMAL FEEDBACK FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS, SEEMS TO HAVE SUCCEEDED IN TRAINING SECONDARY TEACHERS WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE CULTURE OF POVERTY WHO TEACH EFFECTIVELY. (4) THE PROJECT HAS ESTABLISHED SEVERAL AREAS OF NECESSARY CHANGE IN THE TRAINING OF SECONDARY TEACHERS, NAMELY (A) MORE RELATION OF PRACTICE TO THEORY IN METHODS COURSES, (B) GREATER USE OF ON-SITE COURSES (WITH THE NECESSARY PRESENCE OF A COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR) TO DEMONSTRATE THE REALITIES OF THE SCHOOLS, AND (C) GREATER UTILIZATION OF FACULTY IN THE ACADEMIC AREAS IN TEACHER EDUCATION. THE PROJECT HOPES TO MOVE AHEAD WITH CLOSER COOPERATION BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND THE COLLEGE, AS WELL AS TO DEVELOP NEW AIDS FOR THE SUPERVISING TEACHER. (RP)

SP001358

~~01354~~

R good

ED014460

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR ADVANCING THE CULTURALLY HANDICAPPED

TEACH

PROJECT REPORT · IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Psychological
Sociological
Philosophical
Historical

FOUNDATIONS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

ELEMENTARY TEACHER PREPARATION

SECONDARY TEACHER PREPARATION

READING TEACHER PREPARATION

1947

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE AT LOS ANGELES
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

REPORTS
ON
"TEACH"

Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped

School of Education
California State College at Los Angeles
January, 1967

Supported by a curriculum development grant from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in cooperation with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

PREFACE

Project "TEACH", Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped, was a two year teacher-preparation study funded by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Project, under the direction of Dr. Lyle Hanna and Co-directors Dr. Rexford W. Bolling, Dr. Lois V. Johnson, Dr. Kenneth A. Martyn, and Mrs. Elsa May Smith, was a cooperative undertaking of the California State College at Los Angeles, the Los Angeles City Schools, and the Youth Opportunity Board of Los Angeles.

The Project had one major objective, The Preparation of Teachers for Schools of the Inner City. But, it must be recognized at the outset, that whatever success achieved was due to the efforts of many dedicated people ranging across the spectrum from the student participants in the target schools and in the college program to administrative personnel in the Los Angeles City Schools and the California State College at Los Angeles. In the small space available for the acknowledgments, it is impossible to mention by name all those who contributed to the Project.

We wish to recognize the contribution of two pilot projects which furnished basic concepts to be expanded by Project TEACH. These were the Thomas Jefferson High School and the Utah Street Elementary School off campus programs. They developed the framework for teaching methods and techniques in the pre-service preparation of teachers for culturally disadvantaged pupils.

The study was an interdisciplinary approach to the preparation of teachers for disadvantaged areas using consultants from the areas of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and cultural anthropology. New curricula was developed to better prepare teachers entering the teaching profession for the specific tasks they will encounter in teaching children enrolled in elementary and secondary in culturally deprived urban areas. Thirty elementary majors and thirty secondary majors were selected to participate in the Project and received their teaching methods in participating schools in the target area, commonly called "Watts." This experience included method courses, observation, and participation programs in Compton Avenue Elementary School, David Starr Jordan High School, Markham Junior High School, One Hundred and Eleventh Street Elementary School, and Ritter Elementary School.

Due to the complexity of the program the results were published in a series of five reports. Included in the series are the following:

Project Report, Implications, and Recommendations
Foundation Courses for Teacher Preparation
Elementary Teacher Preparation
Secondary Teacher Preparation
Reading Teacher Preparation

It is hoped that these reports will be used in the formulation of teacher preparation programs and be used as a stimuli for further treatment and expansion of teacher preparation programs.

Grateful acknowledge is made to the staff of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development for their encouragement and review of the program. Appreciation is also expressed to Dean Sando, of the School of Education, who encouraged the staff of the School of Education to develop the proposal and to Dean Dahl, his successor, who has seen Project TEACH through to completion. Both men gave the leadership necessary to guarantee the success of such a cooperative effort.

Dr. Mary A. Bany, Chairman of the Elementary Education Department, and Dr. Robert J. Forbes, Chairman of the Secondary Education Department, assumed the leadership roles in their respective departments and insured the success of the program through allocation of staff time and the infusion of promising practices into the regular teacher preparation programs.

Special mention should be made of the efforts of Mr. Sam Hamerman, Director of the Office of Urban Affairs, for the Los Angeles City Schools. He devoted many hours in counseling the staff in the development of the original proposal and established a working relationship with the City Schools.

The contribution of Dr. Marian Wagstaff should be recognized. It was through her efforts that representatives from the college and from the Los Angeles City Schools met to explore the preparation of teachers for urban-area schools.

The names of the Co-directors have been intentionally left to the last as their contributions to the Project cannot be described by mere words. They devoted many hours beyond their regular prescribed load and developed insights to the problem which qualify them as experts in their respective fields.

Dr. Rexford W. Bolling worked with the Elementary majors and developed the reports on the teaching of reading.

Dr. Lois V. Johnson coordinated the Elementary curriculum development portion of the Project and abstracted research in the field, developing the Bibliography alphabetically by author under appropriate categories. This Bibliography includes over 450 items.

Dr. Kenneth A. Martyn coordinated the evaluation of the Project, edited the final report, and was responsible for the portion of the report dealing with the Foundation areas.

Mrs. Elsa May Smith coordinated the Secondary curriculum development report, supervised the teacher training program at the secondary level, and directed the secondary student-teaching program.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the college students, who participated in the Project. Their reactions to various parts of the program have been the basis for the development of recommendations for pre-service and in-service programs for teachers in urban areas.

For additional copies of the report or for specific information, contact:

Lyle Hanna, Associate Dean and Project Director
School of Education
California State College at Los Angeles
5151 State College Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032

Table of Contents

- Acknowledgements . . . 1
- CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION . . . 5
    - Objectives . . . 5
    - Description of Professional Education Requirements . . . 5
    - Areas of Emphasis . . . 8
    - General Vs. Special Methods . . . 8
    - Overview of Chapters to Follow . . . 9
- CHAPTER 2 - RELATING TEACHER PREPARATION TO SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY REALITIES . . . 10
    - Overview of the School and Community Setting . . . 10
        - The Community . . . 10
        - The Setting . . . 11
        - The Target Schools . . . 12
    - On-Site Teacher Preparation . . . 13
        - Pilot Program . . . 13
        - Joint Planning . . . 14
        - The College-Student Participants . . . 15
        - Voluntary Participation . . . 15
        - Plan of Operation . . . 15
        - Participation and Observation Experiences . . . 16
        - Seminar Meetings . . . 16
        - Channels of Communication . . . 17
        - Tour of the Community . . . 17
        - Readings for Education 411 . . . 17
        - Ed. 411 Drop-Out Rate . . . 18
        - Student Teaching and Supplemental Field Experience . . . 18
- CHAPTER 3 - REACTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT TEACH . . . 20
        - Questionnaire Returns . . . 20
    - Taped Interviews . . . 22
        - Reactions to Field Experiences . . . 24
        - Preparation in the Major and/or Minor . . . 30
        - Attitudes Toward Teaching Disadvantaged Adolescents . . . 31
        - Social Stratification Among Students . . . 34
        - Adjusting to Racial Differences . . . 35
        - Discipline . . . 36
        - Understanding the Community . . . 37
        - In-Service Education . . . 39
        - Summary Interpretation . . . 40
- CHAPTER 4 - WORKING WITH PUBLIC SCHOOL FACULTIES . . . 42
    - The Conventional Program . . . 42
    - Changes Introduced by Project TEACH . . . 44
        - Orientation of Training Staff . . . 44
            - Project TEACH: Secondary Student Participation-Observation Procedures . . . 44
        - Transition to Student Teaching . . . 46
        - In-Service Education . . . 46
        - Classroom Teachers as Resource Personnel . . . 50
        - Exchange of Instructional Materials . . . 51

CHAPTER 5 - FOLLOW UP OF PROJECT TEACH PARTICIPANTS. 53
- Trainees Now Teaching. 53
- Where Trainees Elected to Teach. 53
- Trainees Not Teaching. 54
- Individual Follow-Up 55

CHAPTER 6 - PROSPECT AND RETROSPECT. 57
- Reviewing the Objectives. 57
- Questioning Assumptions of the Conventional Program 61
- Summary 62

Appendix 64
- Appendix A1 65
- Appendix A2 66
- Appendix A3 69
- Appendix B. 71
- Appendix C. 72
- Appendix C1 76
- Appendix C2 77
- Appendix C3 78
- Appendix D. 79
- Appendix E. 93

Acknowledgements

Project TEACH was part of a continuing effort by the CSCLA School of Education to provide quality programs for the preparation of teachers. It had as one major objective the preparation of secondary-school teachers for the schools of the inner city.

But, it must be recognized at the outset, that whatever success was achieved was due in large measure to the efforts of a large number of dedicated people ranging across the spectrum from the student participants in the target schools and in the college program to personnel in the upper reaches of administration of the Los Angeles City Schools and California State College at Los Angeles. In the small space available for the acknowledgements, it is impossible to mention by name all those who contributed to the project. But an effort will be made to identify those whose contributions seemed especially notable.

Any review of contributors must begin with a special acknowledgement for the students at Jefferson and Jordan High Schools and at Markham Junior High School. They provided all of us, staff and prospective teachers alike with our subject matter. It was from them that we learned, that we secured first-hand knowledge, that we caught something of the spirit and sense of excitement that only close contact with youth can provide.

Next, the directors and project staff wish to extend their sincere appreciation to the college-student participants, all of whom were prospective teachers. They contributed in numerous ways. They completed what must have been burdensome questionnaires. They took part in interviews. They shared their experiences and their insights. They took part wholeheartedly in the activities of the schools. But, more important than these, they communicated their idealism and their enthusiasm to their pupils in the schools and to all those with whom they worked. In short, they served as an inspiration to all of us, and by doing so, added greatly to our understanding of teacher preparation.

The assistance and understanding of the many classroom teachers, coordinators of special services, and administrators who worked with the participating observers and supervisors is also gratefully acknowledged. Without their help, Project TEACH would not have been possible. Five secondary-school principals are deserving of special mention. These are Mr. Donald Skinner, Principal of Jefferson High School who spearheaded the initial effort to establish a pilot program in his school and thus set the stage for the extension of the program into Jordan High School and Markham Junior High School. Dr. Issac McClelland, Principal of David Starr Jordan High School, at the time of the Project, and currently Assistant Superintendent, shared generously of his knowledge of the Watts community as did his outstanding faculty. In his position as President of the Los Angeles Mid-City Secondary Principals' Association, he performed yeoman service in helping his fellow administrators keep informed of the progress and problems of Project TEACH. Dr. Suttle, who succeeded him as Principal of Jordan High School, has continued the high quality of leadership and has offered encouragement and support to all participants. Mr. Cosby Stone, Principal of Markham Junior High School during Project TEACH, also served in an outstanding leadership capacity and provided a breadth of experiences for the prospective-teacher participants. Working closely with him was his Vice Principal, Miss Tak Nakahara, who worked closely with the participants both as observers and student teachers and later as first-year teachers. To these five leaders and to their dedicated faculties, the Project TEACH staff extends their respect and their appreciation.

Special mention is due also for the contributions of two experienced teacher leaders: Miss Ann Ferguson, Coordinator of Reading at Thomas Jefferson High School, and Mr. Glanville Locket, Chairman of the English Department at David Starr Jordan High School. These capable educators worked with participating observers, student teachers, and first-year teachers from the beginning to the end of the Project; they shared their professional "know-how" with the trainees and conveyed effectively their enthusiasm for teaching. Both assisted the Project staff in the evaluation of the on-site teacher preparation program.

The importance of securing support and cooperation from the Los Angeles City Administration can hardly be over-emphasized. The staff recalls gratefully, for example, the interest of Mrs. Georgianna Hardy of the City School Board, who took time away from an incredibly busy schedule to attend an exploratory meeting at the College when the Project was first conceived. It recalls too the interest and support of Dr. Robert Kelly, Associate Superintendent of Schools, who approved the pilot program at Jefferson High School and gave official authorization for the work to be carried on in the target schools. Dr. Earle Barnett, Administrator of Secondary Assignments, also gave unstintingly of his time. He met with a selected college committee headed by Dr. Sando, Dean of the School of Education, and served a galvanizing role in getting the Project off to a good start. Dr. Sam Hammerman, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Urban Affairs, gave valuable counsel and assistance. He interpreted the Project to community groups and to the Board of Education, and in many ways, facilitated the work of the staff. Mr. Oren Dickason, Supervisor of Teacher Training for the City Schools, also worked closely with both the secondary and elementary aspects of the Project and used the services of his office in assisting the staff.

Appreciation is also expressed to the members of the Department of Secondary Education at California State College at Los Angeles. Their interest and enthusiasm gave encouragement to the directors and participants. They also generously shared materials and gave professional counsel. Special mention is due Dr. Carol Smallenburg, Associate Professor of Education, who took over direction of the pilot project at Jefferson High School and helped develop it into an on-going program. Her enthusiasm for on-site teacher preparation programs has been carried over into Los Angeles County Schools. She developed an outline of criteria for an ideal Education 411 program and a guide for initiating an on-site course.

Dr. Dale Knapp, Associate Professor of Education, is another member of the Department of Secondary Education whose contributions to Project TEACH are extensive. Dr. Knapp was in close communication with the Project directors throughout. In addition to providing many ideas for the original proposal, Dr. Knapp served as interviewer for all taped recordings and assisted with the writing of the final report. His insight into the total teacher-preparation process, his vision of ways to do a better job, and his indefatigable energy should lead to even more effective programs in the years to come.

Dr. Diehl, Director of the Audio-Visual Department, made the facilities of his department available and assigned members of his staff to work directly with Project participants at Markham Junior High School. Unfortunately, space is not available to name the college supervisors from the various disciplines who supervised the directed teaching experiences of secondary school trainees. This responsibility added greatly to already heavy teaching loads through increased travel time and orientation of new public school training personnel.

The singular contribution of Dr. Marion Wagstaff stands high on any listing of acknowledgements related to project TEACH. It was through her efforts that representatives from the college and from the Los Angeles City Schools met early in 1962 to consider what could be done to better prepare teachers for urban-area secondary schools. It was because of her that a college committee headed by Dr. Sando met with Dr. Barnett and the President of the Mid-City Secondary Principal Association to discuss possible innovations. The pilot program at Jefferson High School in 1963-64 and the secondary-education phase of Project TEACH, 1964-66, grew out of these conferences. Thus Dr. Wagstaff's contribution, coming as it did in a critical time of project deliberation, greatly assisted in the implementation of an idea into a program.

Throughout the duration of the Project, Dr. Robert Forbes, Chairman of the Secondary Education Department, assured a leadership role through allocation of staff time, through communication with other departments within the college, and through the encouragement he gave to staff members interested in initiating promising teacher preparation programs. He was also responsible for preparing a report of the pilot program for AACTE which brought recognition to the work being done at California State College at Los Angeles. This report is included in the Appendix to this publication.

Dr. Rudy Sando, Dean of the School of Education at the time the pilot program was initiated and Dr. John Dahl, his successor who has seen Project TEACH through to completion, both gave the leadership necessary to insure the success of such a large cooperative effort. The staff members working directly on the secondary portion of Project TEACH have been aware of the invaluable leadership of these two men.

Many individuals on the secretarial staff helped with the preparation of this report. Only two of them will be named here: Mrs. Ray Ann Rowley and Miss Sylvia Seventy. Mrs. Rowley did the first typing of this report and transcribed the taped interviews with Project participants. Responsibility for preparing the final manuscript has rested with Miss Seventy. The Project TEACH staff is appreciative of their efficient service.

Of the members of the administrative staff of Project TEACH, three have a particular relationship to the secondary-education program: Professors Kenneth Martyn, Lyle Hanna, and Elsa May Smith. Professor Martyn's insight and skill was evident in bringing the various phases of the project into a coordinated whole. Professor Martyn supervised Project TEACH candidates at Markham and Jordan High Schools, provided leadership in program evaluation, and worked closely with other members of the staff in realizing the objectives of the program.

Dr. Lyle Hanna, as Project Director, deserves considerable credit for "worrying through" the birth of Project TEACH in those uncertain days when the countless conferences, clarifications and re-clarifications greatly exceeded the average educator's frustration level. It was his perseverance during these early days when it would have been easier to drop the entire idea, plus his continuing service as chieftain of all operations which indelibly mark his contribution in the records of the Project TEACH. And, the eventual success of Project TEACH was no small factor in the myriad of special projects which the Project sired. Thus, it can be said, without fear of exaggeration, that Associate Dean and Project Director Lyle Hanna played a truly vital role in helping the CSCLA School of Education venture beyond the norm in pursuing more creative approaches to teacher education.

The name of Co-Director Elsa May Smith has been intentionally left to the last "the first shall be last and the last shall be first." Her contribution to the secondary-education phase of Project TEACH and to the teacher-education program exceeds mere verbal description. Mrs. Smith was involved in every phase of the Project. She taught the pilot course at Jefferson High School, later followed her students through at Jordan High School and Markham Junior High School. She worked constantly in a liaison role between the schools and the colleges, holding endless interviews, reporting to the Principal's Association, working with college staff, and in countless ways protecting the welfare of her charges, the Project TEACH students, while never losing sight of the ultimate objective of Project TEACH the attainment of excellence in teacher education. Her contribution truly extended beyond the call of duty. The typical response after completion of a demanding project is to experience a great sense of relief. Co-Director Smith, in contrast, continued to visit her former students, met with them in social functions, and maintained a positive relationship throughout. She, more than any other person, developed the esprit de corps in the secondary-education candidates, imbuing them with a sense of mission and comradeship. Her experience as a former teacher and administrator in Los Angeles City Schools served the program to great advantage. Perhaps the most tangible evidence of her contribution has been the establishment by her former students and associates of an Elsa May Smith Scholarship fund for the students of Jefferson High School. Her influence truly extends both horizontally and vertically beyond the scope of the Project including on the one hand the adoption on increasing number of the on-site class by Secondary-Education Department, and on the other, the less tangible but more profound example of dedication to one's work and an always healthy respect for the students in one's charge.

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

Objectives:

The general objective of the secondary phase of the project, Teacher Education to Advance the Culturally Handicapped (hereafter referred to simply as Project TEACH), was to find more promising ways to prepare prospective secondary-school teachers. The professional sequence for secondary teachers at California State College at Los Angeles (CSCLA) includes course work in foundation subjects such as educational philosophy, sociology, and psychology and in curriculum, methods, and directed teaching. Education course numbers 400 and 410 comprise the foundation offerings while Education 411, 493, and 542 make up the required courses in secondary curriculum, methods, and student teaching. It is these latter courses which concentrate directly on the secondary school that will be emphasized in this report. A brief description of each of the required credential courses will be given in a subsequent section.

The more specific objectives of the secondary-education phase of Project TEACH were:

1. To assist professors in secondary education in implementing changes in teacher education curricula at California State College at Los Angeles.
2. To increase understanding of the culture of poverty on the part of college staff and prospective secondary teachers.
3. To work in a manner that would encourage and give support to teachers presently working in poverty-area secondary schools.
4. To maintain channels of communication among first-year teachers, their principals, and the college staff.
5. To improve the services of the college to the public schools, especially in the areas of recruitment and teaching effectiveness.
6. To help the public schools strengthen their own programs, services, and procedures.

Description of Professional Education Requirements:

All students admitted to the credential program in the School of Education at California State College at Los Angeles (CSCLA) must complete successfully the requirements of the selective-admissions program. These include completion of a series of examinations and the lack of negative data reflecting upon one's personal fitness as a teacher. Initial screening of all candidates is made when a student enrolls in Education 300, Admission to Credential Programs, a non-credit course established to realize the objectives of selective admissions and of orientation to credential requirements. A description of Ed. 300 together with a listing of test areas follows:

EDUCATION 300: (No credit) Admission to Credential Program

Catalog description: "Required of all students qualifying for a teaching credential. Fulfills state requirements for selection and screening of students entering teacher credential curricula."

A candidate for a teaching credential is advised to enroll in Education 300 during the second semester of his sophomore year or, in the case of junior college transfer students, during the first semester at CSCLA. Education 300 students must complete the following tests required for admission to the credentials program:

Writing proficiency test,
Speech test,
Fundamentals test,
Health examination and chest X-ray,
Personality test,
College apitude test.

In addition to selective-admissions requirements, a prospective teacher must complete all work towards an appropriate major and/or minor, show evidence of having completed a broad-well planned program of general education, meet the scholarship and personal fitness requirements set by the Department of Secondary Education, and complete all Education courses required for the secondary credential. Grades in all Education classes must be "C" or better. A brief description of each of the required Education courses follows:

EDUCATION 400: Historical, Philosophical, and Sociological Foundations of Education (3 units)

Catalog description: "Prerequisite: Education 300, Examination of the historical, philosophical, and sociological factors related to the role of the school in American society."

This course is taught on the college campus by faculty drawn from the Elementary and Secondary Education Departments.

EDUCATION 410: Psychological Foundations of Education (3 units)

Catalog description: "Psychological research and theory in human learning and development as related to educational processes."

This course is taught on the college campus by staff members from the Elementary and Secondary Education Departments.

EDUCATION 411: Curriculum, Procedures, Materials and Evaluation in Secondary Schools (4 units)

Catalog description: "Prerequisites: Education 400, 410 concurrently or before. Curriculum practices, instructional procedures and materials, use of evaluative devices and procedures in secondary schools. Students observe and participate in secondary schools one hour, three days per week; audiovisual laboratory one hour per week."

This course is taught on the college campus by faculty in the Department of Secondary Education. Generally these faculty members also teach methods class in a special subject area and supervise student teachers. Each instructor has had secondary school teaching experience. See Appendix A1.

EDUCATION 493: Methods and Materials in Secondary School Subjects (2 units)

Catalog description: "Prerequisites: Education 400, 410, 411 concurrently or before. A series of professional courses intended for prospective secondary school teachers in indicated subject fields. Each course will include consideration of objectives, methods, materials, and problems involved in teaching in the particular field. Each candidate for a secondary credential must complete appropriate methods course in his major and minor. The methods course should be taken prior to Education 542YZ or 443YZ."

The "special methods" classes for teachers of English, mathematics, science, and social studies are generally taught by faculty in the Department of Secondary Education who have specialized in the subject area concerned. All other courses in methods, such as in art, business, foreign language, home economics, industrial arts, music, and physical education, are taught by faculty members in the specialized department concerned. All special methods classes are taught on the college campus. See Appendix A2.

EDUCATION 542YZ: Directed Teaching in the Secondary School (3-3 units)

Catalog description: "Prerequisites: Education 300, 400, 410, 411, 493, and graduate status."

All requirements in Education 300, 400, 410, and 411 must be met before a student is considered for a student teaching assignment. Education 493, "special methods," may be taken concurrently if this is approved by the subject department concerned. Student teaching assignments are in the public schools located within the Los Angeles greater metropolitan area. Each student is required to complete two assignments of directed teaching. An assignment generally includes responsibility for one class in the candidate's major or minor during the course of a semester. The student teacher works under the guidance and daily supervision of a supervising teacher. Student teachers must also complete 50 hours per assignment in supplemental field experiences. The Supplemental Field Experience requirement is intended to provide the student teacher with a broader view of school life than he would otherwise obtain by confining his activities solely to a period of instruction. Supplemental field experiences are kept flexible to meet the individual needs of candidates;

they are also related to the needs and opportunities in the training school. Field experiences typically include some work in the guidance office, the library, the attendance office, assistance with co-curricular activities and observation of classes outside of the regular assignment. An on-campus weekly seminar accompanies student teaching. A statement explaining the Supplemental Field Experience requirement is included in Appendix A3.

Areas of Emphasis:

The areas of emphasis in this report will be represented by the last three courses listed, namely:

Ed. 411	Curriculum, Procedures, Materials, and Evaluation in Secondary Schools
Ed. 493	Methods and Materials in Secondary School Subjects
Ed. 542	Directed Teaching in the Secondary School

Since the titles of these courses are somewhat awkward and unwieldy to repeat in subsequent discussions, they will generally be referred to in abbreviated fashion such as Ed. 411 or general methods and evaluation, Ed. 493 or special methods, and Ed. 542 or directed teaching or simply as student teaching.

Of the three courses listed, the primary emphasis in this report will be given to Ed. 411, the four-unit course in general methods and evaluation. There are several reasons for this. Students from all subject areas are required to enroll in Ed. 411. Ed. 493, in contrast, is organized according to major or minor specializations and each section includes only students with similar majors or minors. All instructors for Ed. 411 are from the Department of Secondary Education thus facilitating communication and curriculum change. Ed. 411 is the only course in the credential sequence, other than directed teaching, in which there is a built-in field experience requirement. Each candidate enrolling in Ed. 411 must complete three hours per week in participation-observation in public schools. These schools are located in reasonably close proximity to the college. And, finally, Ed. 411 as a pre-requisite to student teaching, and usually offered just prior to student teaching, has the greatest potential for effecting change in the total field-experience pattern. Nearly all Ed. 411 instructors also teach a special methods course (Ed. 493) and supervise student teachers. Thus, they are in relatively close contact with the schools and in a position to relate their instruction to the realities of public-school life. Course outlines for Ed. 411 and Ed. 493 together with a description of the participation-observation requirement appears in Appendix A1-2

General Vs. Special Methods:

It was the view of some staff members in the Department of Secondary Education that considerable overlap exists between Ed. 411, which introduces the teacher-education candidate to a wide variety of techniques and methods and Ed. 493 in which techniques and methods are related to the specific teaching major or minor. A particular problem exists also in articulating instruction between the general and special methods courses. As indicated earlier, all Ed. 411 instructors are members of a single department within the School of Education. There is a standing committee of Ed. 411 instructors and communication obstacles are at a minimum. Most Ed. 411 instructors also teach a section of Ed. 493 and supervise student teachers. This community of interest and ease of communication makes innovation much more likely in the general methods area than in the special methods course.

Ed. 493, in contrast, is taught by many instructors outside of the School of Education. For example, faculty in the Art Department teaches courses in special methods for the teaching of art; faculty in the Department of Business Education is responsible for teaching the business-education methods course. A similar situation exists for methods courses taught in physical education, industrial arts, music, home economics, health and safety, and speech. Under such conditions, overlap is much more likely and communication needs transcended departmental lines. In addition, the special methods course does not have the co-requisite field experience requirement enabling college students to have experience in the public schools.

Directed teaching is staffed similarly to the Ed. 493 special methods course. Student teachers in such areas as art, music, physical education, industrial arts, and business education are supervised by instructors in those departments. Student teachers in English, social studies, mathematics, and science are supervised by instructors from the Department of Secondary Education. These instructors generally have had specialized preparation and public-school teaching experience in the subject areas which they supervise.

Overview of Chapters to Follow:

Included in Chapter 2 is a discussion of the design for Project TEACH and an overview of the school and community setting. Chapter 3 contains a report of selected reactions of the college students to their experiences in the Project. Results from questionnaires and from taped interviews are discussed in detail. A general discussion of the importance of working with public-school faculties and of the specific procedures and problems characteristic of Project TEACH are included in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5, follow-up data are presented for all of the original participants. Chapter 6 compares the different procedures used in Project TEACH with those used in the conventional program and suggests guidelines for relating the findings of the demonstration effort to the regular program.

CHAPTER 2 - RELATING TEACHER PREPARATION TO SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY REALITIES

It is frequently charged that teacher preparation is unrealistic, i.e., it is too far removed from the "real-life" situations which confront beginning teachers. In accordance with these views is the highly consistent finding that student-teaching experiences are generally regarded as "the most valuable" by Education students when compared to all other offerings in the teacher-education program. A study in CSCLA's own Department of Secondary Education, "Reactions of Secondary Student Teachers to Preparation in Education Courses" gave considerable re-enforcement to this view. Of all courses in the professional sequence, Ed. 542, Directed Teaching ranked well above the rest.

The staff of Project TEACH gave serious consideration to such criticisms. Indeed, a general purpose underlying all staff efforts was to revitalize teacher-education offerings. In addition to the common charge that teacher-education is too idealistic is a companion criticism directed more specifically to the teachers of the disadvantaged. It has been claimed that classroom teachers suffer from middle-class bias, that they understand neither the disadvantaged learner nor his social and economic circumstances. Having been prepared for work with the middle-class majorities, many are suddenly "deposited" in the disadvantaged communities there to "mark time" for eventual escape to the suburbs. This charge, too, has been made much too often to be ignored.

What could be done within the teacher-education program to provide an effective response to such criticisms? More important, what changes were suggested if teachers were to be better prepared to meet their instructional responsibilities in disadvantaged communities? The manner in which the Project Staff attempted to change the conventional program is described in this chapter. A brief overview of the community and school setting in which project participants were to work will be followed by a description of the plan used to relate instruction in general methods and directed teaching more closely to situational realities.

Overview of the School and Community Setting

The Community:

The community of Watts has received considerable publicity, much of it the direct result of the Watts riots. Professional journalists have filled the pages of newspapers and magazines, sketching with great frequency and repetition a public profile of Watts and its residents. Watts is commonly described as a community of low income and high unemployment, of low social status and high delinquency, of large families and inadequate housing. Frequent mention has been made of broken homes, high school dropouts, and the high proportion of welfare recipients. So much has been reported on the general characteristics of the Watts community that little purpose will be served by repeating what has been said many times previously.

Instead, discussion will center more on community background and the general area served by the target schools of David Starr Jordan High School and Edwin Markham Junior High School. It is in these two schools and the surrounding neighborhood that the efforts of the Project staff were directed. For the purpose of general orientation, a statement from the "Report of the Self Appraisal of David Starr Jordan High School." The statement which follows, was included as part of a report to the California Association of Secondary School Administrators in application for accreditation in May, 1959.

The Setting:

The David Starr Jordan High School District is one of the smallest in land area in the Los Angeles City Schools District. It encompasses an area which was named Watts, after an original settler. The community began as a place where people of limited means could buy a small piece of property in order to live a suburban life. However, the growth of the area was not established by land developers as such communities are today. Rather it was gradually populated by individual families buying separate pieces of property. There was, therefore, little or no community planning. Many streets were unpaved paths following no orderly plan and this condition prevailed until comparatively recent times when some of the streets were paved.

In 1926 the community of Watts became incorporated into the City of Los Angeles. Gradually it developed into a metropolitan type neighborhood or community with a small central business district surrounded by every type of residential habitat, including home owned, multiple and single type rentals, and public housing projects. Skirting the edges of the district are industrial plants of varying size and kind. The business district is located on one street. It has the usual clothing stores, markets, small shops, eating places, and business institutions such as banks and professional offices. Recently it has been improved greatly through a modernization plan established by the local Chamber of Commerce.

. . .

When the school opened in 1926, it served a different district than it does today. At that time it included an area east of Alameda Street on the east side of the tracks. This area is now included in South Gate. The neighborhood served by the school at this time was composed of American families of several different racial backgrounds. Three major groups were present: Anglo-American, Negro, and Mexican-American in about equal proportion; besides there were a good number of Japanese families. Most interesting was a small community, within the district, composed of families of Russian heritage and culture.

Over the years from 1926 to the present, the community has gradually undergone changes in the racial composition of the neighborhood. Now, approximately ninety percent of the people living in the community are Americans of Negro descent, with about eight percent Mexican-Americans. What was once a more or less cosmopolitan living area has become predominately a minority neighborhood.

The residential districts served by Markham and Jordan may be divided roughly into four different types of housing, each representative of slightly different socio-economic levels within the lower middle and lower income brackets. Apart from these is the neighborhood made up mainly of Mexican-American families who tend to isolate themselves from the rest of the community. Roughly speaking, the district housing can be described in terms of four quadrants. In the southeast quadrant, the oldest and poorest housing in the district is located. Small frame substandard houses prevail. Most of the houses are in need of paint and few have lawns or any form of landscaping. The southwest quadrant contains newer, middle class type housing. Here the houses are well kept and landscaping and lawns are the rule. In the northeast and northwest quadrants the housing is older than the west section but it is a home-owners neighborhood which is fairly well kept. The most recent additions to housing are four public housing projects. The projects have replaced some of the poorest housing in the area. Most of the businessmen do not live in the community . . . .

The Target Schools:

As indicated earlier, the target schools were Edwin Markham Junior High School and David Starr Jordan High School. The junior high, with an enrollment of approximately 2,500 students in 7-, 8-, and 9th grades has a very modern physical plant, light, airy, and resonably well-equipped classrooms, an auditorium, a multi-purpose room, cafeteria, and excellent physical education and play area. The grounds and school plant are kept in excellent condition; indeed the school is a place of beauty within a very drab, uninviting community setting. The Markham student body is approximately 95% Negro, 4% Mexican, and 1% miscellaneous. Like all Los Angeles City Schools, Markham has an integrated faculty approximately 60% being non-Negro. Only 30% of the faculty members at Markham are permanent teachers with more than three years experience within the Los Angeles City School District. Most of the students who graduate from Markham Junior High are expected to continue their educations at the much older Jordan High School which is located a mile distant.

David Starr Jordan High School is a three (3) year senior high school with an enrollment of 1,900 students. The majority of the students enter from three contributing junior high schools: Charles Drew, Samuel Gompers, and Edwin Markham. Markham Junior High, located at 104th Street and Compton Avenue, contributes about 80% of the students in each new class. Approximately 8% of the incoming students come from Gompers and about 8% from Drew. The remainder of the students come from the Compton District, from other areas in the City and State, or from out of State. The ethnic composition of the Jordan High School student body is approximately 91% Negroes, 8% Mexican Americans, and 1% others. The faculty is integrated.

Markham Junior High and Jordan High School have felt the impact of the transitional character of the neighborhood. The high rate of transiency in the school population has made it difficult to build community morale and school spirit. The senior high school has had a difficult time trying to maintain curriculum offerings to meet the needs of its students. Possibly the unique characteristic of the neighborhood is the role of gateway or entry it plays for the immigrant families which arrive from out of the state.* Many of the families come from small, rural, segregated communities where they have long suffered inequities in schooling and in cultural opportunities. A small group of more able immigrant families from eastern and middle western states also come to the area. Usually the students from these families are more able scholastically. The pattern of transiency generally operates to the detriment of the school. The ablest families, as soon as they become economically strong, move to what they consider more desirable neighborhoods, thus depriving the school and the community of potential leadership and of the more able students.

On-Site Teacher Preparation

In an effort to assist teacher-education students to understand the school and community setting and to provide prospective teachers with close and continuing contact with disadvantaged learners, it was decided that a more intensive and extensive exposure to actual conditions in the school and community was necessary than that provided in the regular teacher-education program. The solution agreed upon was to explore the problems and possibilities associated with moving Ed. 411, the general methods course, off campus into the public school setting. This entailed some inconvenience since both the Ed. 411 instructor and all members of his class would need to meet away from the college campus and add travel time to existing schedules.** Nevertheless, with the cooperation of the Los Angeles City Schools and the financial assistance for travel from the L.A. Youth Opportunity Board, it was decided that the advantages outweighed the disadvantages.

Pilot Program:

Before entering the target area schools of Markham Junior High and Jordan Senior High, a pilot program was started at Thomas Jefferson High School in Los Angeles City during the 1963-64 school year. Jefferson's student population is also largely Negro and conditions were sufficiently similar to the target area to make a pilot effort realistic. The Jefferson pilot program received the enthusiastic support of the principal,

---

*The commonly quoted generalization that Watts is a "port of entry" with unusually high transiency has recently been questioned. A recent survey reported in the Los Angeles Times reveals that 87% of the families have lived in the area 15 years or more.

**A comparable program, directed by Professors Julian Roth and James Gilmore was introduced at Franklin High School in Los Angeles in 1959. This program was an important forerunner of Project TEACH. It was not continued because of lack of enrollment.

Mr. Donald Skinner, and of his faculty. This undoubtedly was a major factor in its success. The pilot program at Thomas Jefferson High School has become a part of the on-going pre-service teacher-education program and at this writing is still a thriving, growing operation, popular with both college students and the Jefferson faculty. In addition, the pilot program effectively set the pattern for the work undertaken in the Watts area schools during 1964-66. The pilot course was taught by Co-Director Elsa May Smith who also instructed all project students in subsequent work at Markham and Jordan.

The pilot program had such a positive influence upon personnel selection at Jefferson High School and upon the regular CSCLA teacher-education program that it was later submitted to the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to be considered for the AACTE Distinquished Achievement Award. A comparable program was initiated by the Department of Elementary Education at the Utah Street Elementary School. A complete description of the Utah and Jefferson projects was included in the statement prepared for consideration by the AACTE. Interested readers are referred to a copy of the AACTE report in Appendix E.

Joint Planning:

During the spring and summer of 1964 frequent conferences were held between the college project staff and the secondary school leadership in the Los Angeles City Schools. It was determined that field experiences for the prospective teachers would be provided at Markham Junior High School and at David Starr Jordan High School. Practices proved successful and the Jefferson pilot program served as a model. Ways of working and areas of responsibility were clearly defined; faculties were alerted.

Shortly after the opening of the public schools in September 1964 the Director and Co-directors of the proposed project "Teacher Education to Advance the Culturally Handicapped" met with the faculties at Markham and Jordan to explain the program and answer any questions that might arise. This was done several weeks before the college students were brought into the schools. The administrators, faculty, and high school student leaders agreed to plan orientation periods as a means of acquainting the college people with the work of the two schools. Thus, much thought and preparation went into setting the stage for the entrance of the thirty-one students into the poverty area schools.

It was originally planned for each participant to be required to take a class concurrently on campus in "Developmental Reading in the Secondary School." Although advisable this proved impractical, first because credential requirements do not include a reading methods class and secondly because of the conflict with course requirements in the major subject teaching fields. With the teacher shortage for urban area schools, and the current controversy concerning academic discipline vs "how to do" courses, an added requirement could not be enforced without seriously reducing the number of participants.

During September and before being introduced into the classroom situations, the college students with their instructor began looking for answers to some of the following questions:

1. What do we know about the community in which these schools are located?
2. Where can we get further information about this community?
3. What do we know about the young people who attend these two schools?
4. From what lower level schools do the students come?
5. Where do students of these schools go after graduation?
6. What happens to the drop-outs?
7. What do we know about the organization of these schools?
8. What curricula or courses are offered? Why?
9. What do we know about the professional leadership in these schools?
10. What are the major responsibilities of teachers in secondary schools and in these schools in particular?

Tentative answers to these questions were later clarified or amplified in the orientation periods or through direct experience.

The College-Student Participants:

Early in October, 1964, a class of thirty-two college students in Education 411 was moved from the college campus to a classroom in Edwin Markham Junior High School located in the Watts area of the Los Angeles City School District. The students had all completed the Education 300 selective-admissions requirement and each had indicated a desire to serve in the inner city schools. Eighteen of the thirty-two students held college degrees and had graduate status. Fourteen were undergraduates. Of these, eleven were in their senior year and three in the junior year. Twenty of the original participants were Caucasian, eleven were Negro, and one was an Oriental. One participant was dropped relatively early in the program making a total of thirty-one candidates.

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in Project TEACH was kept on a voluntary basis: Students had the option of applying for the original project. They were later assigned to student teaching in the same school only if they elected to do so and the assignments were approved by the target-school personnel. Later, many were offered employment in the same schools, but again employment was at the option of both parties.

Plan of Operation:

The plan of operation in the Markham-Jordan program called for the college students to spend one morning each week in a seminar meeting at

Markham with the college instructor. Two hours daily were to be spent in observation and participation activities at Markham and Jordan. The class was divided into two groups: Group 1 worked for eight weeks at Markham and a second eight weeks at Jordan. Group 2 worked eight weeks at Jordan followed by eight weeks at Markham. Thus, the prospective teachers were given the opportunity to work directly with students from the seventh through the twelfth grades. Professor Kenneth Martyn and Co-Director Elsa May Smith shared responsibility for the supervision of the trainees.

Participation and Observation Experiences:

Each prospective teacher spent one hour each day observing and working in a class in his teaching major area. A second hour was spent in working in one of the service areas of the school such as attendance, health, guidance, or library. Prospective teachers were given opportunity to work closely with counselors and vice principals. Each student kept a daily log of his experiences and observations. Frequently these observations and experiences served as discussion topics in the weekly seminars. The logs were turned into the college instructor at midterm; they were returned with notes and suggestions. Logs of the participation-observation experiences were collected again at the close of the semester. In order to assure that each prospective teacher had practical, worthwhile, and meaningful experiences in the schools, the college instructor frequently conferred with the participating classroom teachers. Each classroom teacher was asked to report at midterm and at the close of the semester on the participation-observation experiences of the student assigned to his class or to his service area. The reporting form used for this is included in the Appendix to this report. See Appendix B.

In their work in the public schools, the staff tried to give as well as receive help. It was made clear to the prospective teachers and to the classroom teachers that a reciprocal helping relationship was to be maintained. While learning from the classroom teacher, the young teacher-to-be was expected to serve as a helper. Just how the prospective teacher was to help the regular teacher was kept flexible, although a list of suggestions was provided.

It is interesting to note that the prospective teachers prized most highly the opportunities they had to actually work with the secondary school youth; participants worked with individual students and with small groups. Such opportunities were provided very early for all candidates. The highlight came when the prospective teacher was asked to plan for and present a lesson to an entire class for part or for an entire period. Such experiences were enthusiastically shared in the weekly seminars.

Seminar Meetings:

The topics covered in the weekly seminars were those called for in the curriculum guide for all Education 411 classes at California State College at Los Angeles, but the order was in large measure determined by the needs of the participants and the activities going on in the two secondary schools. Three areas received major attention, namely: secondary

curriculum, materials and procedures, and evaluation. On occasion, counselors, administrators, and teachers from the participating schools were invited to take part in the seminar discussions.

Channels of Communication:

Each of the participating schools provided mail boxes for the college supervisor and the college students. The weekly calendars and all bulletins issued to the regular teachers were also given to the people from the college. In fact, the prospective teachers and their instructor were included in all activities carried on by the participating schools.

The college instructor prepared a weekly bulletin for the prospective teachers. This bulletin contained notices of special meetings, suggestions for reading, required assignments, and announcement of college or school-sponsored events of interest to teachers. In fact, the participants were treated from the beginning as professional teachers and as far as possible were expected to operate as professional people.

An "Outline Guide for Establishing an On-Site Course" which was prepared by Professor Carol Smallenburg is shown in Appendix C. Samples of weekly bulletins used by Co-director, Elsa May Smith are in Appendix C2.

Tour of the Community:

In addition to reading and talking about the community in which the target schools were located, a tour of the area was organized and directed by the Vice Principal of Markham Junior High School. The college students visited the Westminister Community Center, the Watts Health Center, and the Watts Towers. During their visits, they were met by staff workers, shown the facilities, and given opportunity to ask questions. Attention was drawn to the business district and to two recently completed buildings--a bank and a post office. One of the public housing projects was visited and three others were identified for the prospective teachers.

The areas of attractive, well-kept homes and refurnished apartment houses as well as the undesirable slum housing conditions were noted. Students also observed the locations of parks and playgrounds as well as the lack of commercial recreation facilities such as theaters, motion picture houses, bowling alleys, and such. The boundaries of the community that seem almost to wall in the people were noted. Prospective teachers observed the church and parochial school attempts to serve the people of the Watts community - in fact effort was continuously expended to make them observant and sensitive to the environment in which the schools are located and the conditions under which the people live.

Readings for Education 411:

A library of reference materials was set up in the seminar classroom at Markham. Included were books and materials in anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Magazines, paperbacks, and books that might help students gain insight into the problems of the Negro people were made available.

The Los Angeles City Schools provided a complete set of secondary curriculum guides in all subject areas for use by the class. The instructor brought her own professional books for use by the prospective teachers. Thus, reference material was easily available, and it was unnecessary for students to return frequently to the college campus for reading materials.

Much freedom in the selection of reading materials was permitted. Brief reports on 4 x 6 cards were required. Students were encouraged to bring to the attention of the group articles, films, or books that they found of special interest. The simple form used for reporting reading is included in the Appendix to this report. See Appendix C3.

Ed. 411 Drop-Out Rate:

Of the thirty-two students originally enrolled in Education 411 thirty-one prospective teachers completed the course satisfactorily. Early in November 1964, one young man in the class was advised to "drop" this course. Although he had very high scholarship, a faculty committee in the college was convinced that he should not be permitted to continue in the teacher preparation program at the college.

Student Teaching and Supplemental Field Experience:

Few major modifications were made in the regular student-teaching requirements. The primary difference as compared to the conventional program was that much more attention was given to supporting conditions prior to student teaching. Student teachers in Project TEACH were already accepted as part of the school faculty. The usual adjustment problems of the beginning student teacher were resolved in the on-site work prior to student teaching. Student teachers in Project TEACH experienced fewer problems in becoming oriented to the school because for a period of four-and-a-half months they had become a part of the school.

A change was made mid-way in the Project in the Supplemental Field Experience Requirement. Field experiences were considered as part of one package and an attempt was made to coordinate the on-site work in Ed. 411 with the Supplemental Field Experience requirement in Directed Teaching. In general, all participants were to complete school-related activities in three different areas: Subject-Area Related; Community Related; and School-Service. A suggested listing of activities prepared by the co-director follows:

Area 1. Subject Area Related Activity

- Attendance at a Los Angeles City Teacher Institute.
- Attendance at a professional conference or teacher in-service workshop.
- Preview of audio-visual material in your major or minor subject field - but not in preparation for teaching your assigned class.
- Preview of audio-visual material related to teaching disadvantaged youth.
- Attendance at a subject area department meeting.
- Assisting another teacher with a class field trip.

Area 2. Community Related Activity

Attendance at local PTA meeting.
Attendance at a local Community Coordination Council meeting.
Participation in groups sponsored by a group work agency (YMCA, Westminister Community Center, etc.)
Field trip to Instructional Services Division, Los Angeles City Schools
Visit to public library serving Markham or Jordan students.
Field trip to a specialized school such as Garden Gate or Jackson.
Attendance at Los Angeles City Board of Education meeting.
Visit to a YOB sponsored youth group.

Area 3. School-Service Activity

Assist faculty at school dances or parties.
Assist faculty at sports night or school-sponsored sports events.
Assist with assembly supervision.
Assist with yard or noon supervision.
(You might ask the principal to assign you to some needed area of service.)

Thus, it is clear that Project TEACH was the result of an over-all plan - a plan which emerged through the joint efforts of school and college staff. The low drop-out rate for the Ed. 411 class, the provision for voluntary participation, the treatment which the college-student participants received by regularly employed professionals, the unifying pattern of sequential field experiences, and the interest and cooperation of the Los Angeles City School administration all give impressive and persuasive testimony that Project TEACH was perceived as a forward step in the education of the disadvantaged and in pre-service preparation of teachers.

CHAPTER 3 - REACTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT TEACH

Project TEACH represented what the staff considered to be a promising departure from the conventional method of preparing teachers. From initiation to termination, considerable time, effort, and thought was expended by the Project staff. They were understandably eager to secure as much evaluative feedback as possible. Questionnaires were administered. Numerous observations were made. Administrators, teachers, and the candidates themselves were interviewed. It is the intention of this discussion to report the results. In this connection, selected findings of a questionnaire survey will be discussed. The questionnaires were administered in the early phase of the Project just prior to the completion of the Ed. 411 on-site course and previous to directed teaching. Later, near completion of the Project a small number of taped interviews were held.

Questionnaire Returns:

As part of the questionnaire survey, participants were asked the following questions:

1. Do you think your attitudes toward children have been changed or modified as the result of your experiences in Project TEACH? Please explain.
2. As you see it, what are the strong points of this program?
3. As you see it, what are the weak points of this program?
4. What suggestions would you give to teacher educators in preparing and placing new teachers for work with the culturally deprived?

A complete report of the responses given appears in Appendix D. Only a short synopsis of the responses will be discussed here.

Approximately a week before the Final Examination in January, 1965, each student was given an envelope containing a questionnaire and instructed to fill it out, seal the envelope, and bring it to the instructor on or before the Final Examination. Students were assured that the envelopes would not be opened until after final marks were on file in the office of the college registrar. In this way it was hoped participants would feel free to answer the questionnaire honestly, knowing that their answers would in no way affect their college grades for the course.

The majority of respondents believed that their attitudes had changed and that they had profited considerably from their on-site experiences. Responses such as the following were typical:

> I am more willing to believe now that children are products of their environment. I am also more willing to take them on their own ground. I am more patient when my neighbors don't understand and more eager to see each child as an individual and not just as a "kid."

> After talking to some of the parents and seeing the living conditions under which some of these children are brought up I can see why the children have so much trouble adjusting to the society norms. This environment is also a great hindrance in the educational patterns or attitudes of the children.
>
> I've gained a deeper understanding of their problems in general. This altered my belief somewhat that many of them were "troublemakers."

Among the responses to the question on attitude change, a number of respondents indicated that their attitudes were not changed so much as re-enforced. They indicated that their basic respect for people or that their own experiences growing up in mixed neighborhoods gave them a viewpoint which prevailed throughout Project TEACH.

The impressions of participants concerning the "strong points" of the program tended to confirm the expectations of the staff that on-site field experiences would yield positive educational returns. The following comments illustrate this very clearly.

> The strongest point I see in the program is the close association with the areas in which one expects to teach. Project TEACH has given us a chance to test ourselves, a chance to grow in understanding, and a chance to decide whether or not we are qualified to teach such children.
>
> The program is valuable because it gives the new teacher an opportunity to work in an area and experience its problems in person instead of just reading about it or hearing about it in a lecture. Even if some of the students in the program do not eventually select this area to teach in, they have, because of this program, a greater awareness of the problems . . . .
>
> I think this program has taught me a hundred times more than sitting in a lecture class. In a class there are so many idealistic theories that attract you and you think will work, but actual application of methods and techniques are more than anyone can ask for. It's (Project TEACH) a great experience.

Responses to the question, "What are the weak points of this program?" revealed a variety of answers. Some complained that they were "pushed for time." Others indicated that more seminar time should be provided, while two or three respondents indicated that they would have preferred some experience in a contrasting upper-socio-economic school in order to make valid comparisons. Selected responses follow:

> Time was probably the weakest point in the program. I always felt pushed. My class schedule was such that I had to hurry back to State College and never really had a chance to do the research I wanted to on the students with whom I was working.

This is hard to say, but if you don't know what a "normal" school is like you have nothing with which to compare. Teaching in a culturally deprived area may leave the impression that all schools are like that. Maybe if there was some way to compare different types of schools, this might be useful.

The only weak point I detected was the small amount of time we had for our weekly seminar. I would have desired more time for all of us to discuss our classroom situations and offer suggestions on ways to improve and become better future teachers.

Advice to teacher educators and to administrators took the following form:

I feel very strongly that a program such as this one is needed. Teachers need to see and work in and feel for the area in which they work.

Keep it on a choice level. Many teachers working in this area are there because it was the only job available. Encourage students to gain information about the area and they will go into the area with the attitude that they're going because they want to go.

Have a guidance clinic where students from the culturally deprived areas can discuss their problems with future teachers. In this way, we can better understand their problems.

Try to screen out early those who are opportunists and those teachers who have a fatalistic attitude of the students' "permanent lack of ability."

The over-all impression gained from reading through all of the comments was that of a solid endorsement of the benefits of college-directed on-site work in the schools. Readers may want to test this statement by reading the complete statement of reactions which appears in the appendix. It is also important to repeat here that the responses came relatively early in the preparation, prior to student teaching and to actual employment. Subsequently, interviews were directed at selected candidates who were either in the process of completing the student-teaching assignments or were already employed.

Taped Interviews

Seven candidates were selected for the taped interviews. Five of the candidates were Caucasian, two were Negro; two were male, five were female. One was completing her first assignment of student teaching. Another was completing his second and final assignment. Four were beginning the second semester of the first year of full-time employment. One candidate was mid-way in his second year of employment.

The purpose of the interviews was similar to that of the questionnaire inquiries. The staff wanted to secure the over-all reaction of the candidates to the quality of their preparations. What specifically was their reaction to the on-site Education courses? What changes in the program would they suggest or support? What clues could be secured about the adequacy of the teaching major or minor? The data in Chapter 3 suggest many of the answers.

More important to the staff, however, than the candidate's reactions to the formal program and to specific elements of course work were the attitudes which they held. What was the evidence, if any, of the presence or lack of an esprit de corps? How did they appear to be relating to the disadvantaged adolescents in their classes? How did they identify with the objective of educating disadvantaged youth? Had they acquired a sense of mission and dedication? Or, were they simply enduring their present responsibilities and awaiting an appropriate time for escape to the suburbs?

For such objectives, the interview seemed especially appropriate. It permitted the probing and follow-up questions necessary for an in-depth analysis. It was flexible, enabling the interviewer to seek clarification when necessary and to respond to clues which cannot be predicted in a questionnaire or interview guide. While an interview guide was constructed, the candidates were informed that the questions were intended merely as a guide and that they need not feel restricted to the questions asked or required to follow the question sequence.

All but two of the interviews were conducted in the private home of a member of the Project staff. Approximately one-half day was used for each interview. Interviews were generally initiated in the second half of the morning after all the participants had breakfasted together and had ample time for rapport-building conversation. In such circumstances, rapport came easily and conversation during the interview flowed freely with little evidence of inhibition.

The interviewer, a member of the college faculty and a former counselor, was not a regular member of the Project staff. Thus, the possibility of excessive ego involvement was minimized.

The decision to use the tape recorder was based on a number of reasons. Taping an interview eliminated the need to break continuity while notes were taken. It assured much more complete information than would otherwise have been possible. It provided a kind of permanent record which would be available for analysis by other staff members. The taped recordings could be used in any other part of the program. It also captured the feeling tone of a response in a way that would be virtually impossible if sole reliance were placed on a written record. Initial fears that the presence of a tape recorder would hinder rapport and inhibit free communication proved groundless. The respondents talked freely, effortlessly, evidencing a real need for talking out their experiences.

In all but one case, candidates were interviewed in pairs. This facilitated an exchange of information, provided peer stimulation and support, and, doubtlessly, added considerably to the high level of rapport maintained throughout the interviews. Typed transcripts were prepared for each interview. The comments to follow were taken from these transcripts. They are organized around the following categories:

(A) Reactions to Field Experiences
(B) Preparation in the Major
(C) Attitudes toward Teaching Disadvantaged Adolescents
(D) Importance of the Community and of In-Service Assistance

Reactions to Field Experiences:

One of the more publicized innovations in Project TEACH was the "on-site Education course." As explained earlier, this involved moving Education 411, a pre-credential course which combined instruction in curriculum, method, and evaluation with three hours per week of observation in the schools, away from the campus classroom where it was typically taught into a school in a disadvantaged neighborhood. Thus, students and instructor traveled to a selected public school for both the formal instruction and for the guided participation-observation activities. Qualified candidates were invited to remain in the same school for student teaching, and in some cases, were later employed as first-year teachers in the same school in which they had received their preparation in methods and student teaching. Did the candidates perceive the on-site preparation to be of value? Responses to this question follow:

> Interviewer: B, you're in your second semester of student teaching, and A, you're in your first assignment of student teaching. And I understand that you both went through the on-site Ed. 411 course; "on-site" meaning, of course, taught at the school instead of on the college campus. This is a little different from the way that just about all of the rest of our program is conducted. Can you tell us a little bit about what you did in that course and in what way it differed, other than simply being a new location.
>
> A: As far as I'm concerned what 411 did for me, as far as being on the school campus, it took me into the atmosphere. It also helped me get the feel of being on a high school campus - something I had never had before other than as a student. Education 411 ran through just about everything I thought I would need as a teacher, including discipline problems, lesson plans, and even down to working with audio-visual aids and so-on-and-so-forth. I felt like nothing was lacking. I had a little bit of methods, observations - an awful lot of observations - and I felt quite sufficient in my education after I had had that class - secure. (Student teacher - Negro female.)
>
> Interviewer: Let's compare that to the course had you taken it on campus. For example, you would still have got lesson planning, you would have still discussed discipline I would imagine - it would depend very much on your instructor. You would have spent three periods a week in a school. It might have been three days a week or it might have been all in the same day. Now, how did this saturation program - being in a school - add a new dimension to what you would have received had you been on campus?
>
> A: Well, in my own personal experience I had a history class at Jordan and for four days a week straight I was in that class. The students got to know me. There was no guessing as to when I would

be there because I was there four days in a row. This helped because I was accepted by the students and then I could establish a relationship with the students. This is quite different, I imagine, from the college on-campus class. I've never had that class, but I should think it would be different because observations are "spotty" . . . when you're there on that school's campus, you're not spotty - you have a regular pattern established and you have a regular pattern with the students, which helps. It helps you in establishing yourself as a teacher or future teacher. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

Interviewer: Were you both in the same class? You were. How did you react, B?

B: Well, I thought the 411 class I had actually did two things: one, it provided the real school atmosphere because we were right there; and two, we had what was called seminar meetings once a week where we could discuss problems and various things that we didn't quite understand, that we didn't have a chance to talk about with the teacher during the time we were observing. So, these two things, I think, being able to be there and watch the procedures of the other teacher, and sometimes even teaching yourself. And then thinking over these various aspects and taking them to the class and getting involved with the other students and talking about it, sort of handing the problem around, you see some sore spots and the strengths and weaknesses. This did more than I think a class on campus could ever do from that standpoint alone. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

Interviewer: Would you like to see all the courses in education taught in a school?

S: I think it's a very good idea because you can relate the practice and the theory and you're not just talking pie in the sky. You can relate it down to practical matters, and I think that's important because if you've never had it until you've student taught, all of a sudden you're smacked in the face with all of it. I think the paper work, if you've never been exposed to it, can kill the best of teachers before they've ever gotten started. That first faculty meeting when they give you a pamphlet twenty pages long telling you what to do, you collapse! And I almost did! (First year teacher - female.)*

A third interview follows with a transfer student.

Interviewer: You're going to enter your second semester of your first year now and you had the on-site 411 course, you've had the regular student teaching in the same school in which you had your 411, and now you've taught full-time, had your own class for a semester. Is there anything you could point out that you felt especially well-prepared as a result of the formal training program at the College? If you had to identify the plusses or the positives, are there any that you can think of or that would immediately come to mind?

---

*Unless otherwise indicated, respondent is a Caucasian.

F: Being in a special class like Art, I think our methods in Art are probably the most important and I did take those at another college, so I won't speak of that. I think most of my Education classes except the on-site were a waste. They gave me a taste, or they superficially covered some of the things that were valuable, and I didn't, of course, have to take many of these things because of my on-site work. I didn't take "History and Philosophy of Education" and I don't know that I would need that either. I think the on-site work in my curriculum and methods in 411 was probably the outstanding thing; it was much different than anything else I was doing. It didn't bore me with a lot of things that I thought were obvious. Now, it seems like I'm contradicting my first statement that I needed more! What I'm saying is that I think my 411 on-site was outstanding and the fact that being experienced I went into my school feeling like an experienced teacher. I wasn't having the problems that other first-year teachers were having in discipline and knowing the ropes. But, I do think that the on-campus work should have been better in background. (First year teacher - female.)

The comments above tended to be consistent with other formal and informal feedback that had been secured. Moving education courses to an actual school site appeared to be a step forward in teacher preparation. However, the design of the on-site program was also a matter of interest to the Project staff. Should on-site experiences be limited to one school in one type of area or should they be divided between, say, two different types of schools such as a junior high and a senior high or possibly, two schools located in contrasting socio-economic backgrounds. Are prospective teachers apt to have a more valuable experience if special methods courses in the major or minor are required to be completed prior to student teaching or is there greater educational mileage in offering special methods at the same time or concurrent with student teaching? What do the candidates think? Their responses are not unequivocal nor do they give us mandates for change but they do add much relevant information.

Interviewer: How did you like this idea of splitting your time between two schools? You spent about ten weeks at Jordan and about ten weeks at Markham. Would you have preferred to spend all of your time at one of the schools? Did it give you any kind of experiences that you considered valuable to be at two schools rather than one?

B: In the beginning, after the first ten weeks, I didn't want to leave Jordan. I thought that I should stay there and really get the feel of it for another ten weeks. But it was an agreement that we change over, and I found in the end that it was more helpful to me because now I'm doing my student teaching in a junior high school and I sort of was able to feel my way around a little bit. Now I keep looking back at that experience I had at Markham when I'm dealing with my own students in the class I have now. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

A: This is the same reaction I got. At first I didn't want to. I didn't see the necessity of my having to go to a junior high school. After all, I had been to a high school and what could be harder than a high school? It just couldn't be much different. I was surprised, truly surprised . . . and pleased at the same time. But on the other hand, I didn't like it because I thought, "Maybe this should be a year program," because just as soon as I established myself with the students at Jordan, I had to leave them and re-establish myself with the students at Markham. It was quite a transition, especially if this is your first experience in the school. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

Interviewer: You took all the other courses on campus, including your 493 - your special methods course. Would that have been a more valuable course for you had that also been in a school?

B: Well, I certainly think that it would have. I found myself trying to implement some methods - my own methods - at the time I was taking the methods course concurrently, and it was on campus. If it had been in the schools, I could have been using some of the theories, or at least seeing if they could work in the classroom. But having it here on campus sort of separated me from the situation. I couldn't just put my ideas into practice right there on campus and think, "What will I do now?" "What will I do in this situation?" because when you're not there, it sort of leaves you - at least it does me - the whole idea, the whole atmosphere. You can't feel it. You can visualize it to a point and then you lose it. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

Interviewer: Did you have your 493 before student teaching or along with student teaching?

B: Before student teaching.

A: I had my 493 before student teaching and I was taking it concurrently with 411 - participation-observation. We created situations in our 493 class and it left room for imagination. We used . . . everyone in class tried to use their imagination. Every week we had a different student be the teacher, and this helped. It made it just like being in a classroom except we were a little bit older than high school and junior high school students. But it did help insofar as we felt our way through. We still used practical application, but we were on the college campus, in a college classroom - pretending that it was a high school or junior high school - whatever the lesson called for that particular day. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

Interviewer: Now think of the kind of experiences, the kind of problems, and the kind of opportunities that you're having now as student teachers. Would it have been more helpful to you - as you speculate about it - to be studying 493 special methods as you're doing your student teaching rather than to have it prior to student teaching?

A: I think it would be invaluable. I would much rather have it now, because you have these little things . . . you want to run to somebody and say "Something happened today." If you don't write it down as soon as it happens, you can't get any help from it and even if you do write it down, you talk to your supervisor about it, but it's much better to have other students to talk to about what has occurred this week or the past week. I think my methods would have meant a little bit more to me if I had been doing them concurrently with student teaching. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

B: I agree with A on that. I believe that right now I'm so bogged down with the menial tasks of teaching - taking roll and keeping class discipline - that really I don't have much time left to implement methods or my theory of how to bring about more effective learning. If I had it now, then I could begin to visualize just what I would do with the class; it would have solidified my teaching procedures. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

Interviewer: Some people recommend that we not have programs such as you went through - at least not saturation programs of that type - but that we give the student a broad background; not only putting him in a senior high and a junior high but that we place him for student teaching, for example, or for observation in an upper socio-economic class community and then for another part of his experience in a lower socio-economic class community, and I guess there are advantages and disadvantages. The other way would be hard for you to answer this. But . . . you did one assignment at Jordan and the other assignment at Markham. I know that there are some differences, but they're really not that far apart. I know both schools and both areas. What do you think your reaction would have been if you went out some place near West Covina for one of your assignments?

B: No doubt I would have been appalled at just the thought of having to go to a school of that nature. I would feel much more self-conscious and I think it would affect my teaching. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

Interviewer: You would have resisted the idea?

B: I would have resisted the idea and if I had to go it would have definitely affected me as a teacher.

A: I would have gotten the Encyclopedia Britannica and I would have tried to read straight through it, knowing that these students would be much smarter than I. I would have looked forward to it. I think I would have liked it . . . not as much but I think I would have liked it. But I would have tried to make myself a challenge to the students. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

A somewhat different reaction was secured from another interviewer. The fear of being "type-cast" was not mentioned by other candidates.

Interviewer: Some have recommended that student teachers should have field experiences balanced between a suburban area or let's say a middle class or upper-middle class area and the disadvantaged area rather than all in one place. I just wondered what your reaction would be to this.

F: Well, it's kind of on both sides. I rather wish that at least one of my student teaching experiences had been in some other area, because I think I'm being type-cast as are the administrators who work in the particular area and as are the teachers. Once you're there you're supposed to be an expert in it and you're stuck with it whether you really want to be there after awhile, or whether you really should have been there in the first place. I do wish I'd had some other kind of experiences just so I would have something to compare it to. (Female.)

Interviewer: Do you remember when we were talking to F, she mentioned something about being "type-cast," that you see the world maybe through gray-tinted glasses because your entire teacher preparation has been in one of the urban areas? Now you're working in the area. Looking back, would you rather have seen a little of both worlds, let's say had part of your field experience or your actual teaching experience in a suburban area and say, the other part of it in central Los Angeles or the Watts area?

E: I would say that a program perhaps where you had a lot of participation, observation, and real concentration in the Watts area or wherever it's going to be, and then say, a chance to work in another school - Marshall, Hollywood, whatever you name, something that is more, say, typical, middle class kind of thing, that you could have a point of reference. . . And I am particularly handicapped, I feel, because I went always to private schools. I went to a private grade school, private high school, private college. This was my first encounter with public school education, so I feel that I really do not know what even a typical kind of high school is like because I was never in one myself. (First year teacher - Female.)

The value of placing at least two candidates in the same school is illustrated below.

E: I think a really good thing for the two of us is that we happen to be at the same school, very honestly. It's really been a tremendous boost for me, at least, to know that there is somebody else who went through the same program and we can, in a sense, sit down and give each other a shot of . . . well, you know. . . . (First year teacher - female.)

R: And ideas; I think we both help each other. We discuss situations that we have and ideas, and it helps so much. (Female.)

E: Because we both know that the other one cares about what's going on, too, and many times you're not sure that there's a sympathetic ear with other faculty in terms of really caring, really being concerned and really wanting to find out the things that could be changed. (First year teacher - female.)

Preparation in the Major and/or Minor:

Interviewer: As you think back do you have any comments or reactions to preparation in your major? We've talked a little bit so far about education courses, about what can be done, what's relevant and what isn't. Now, you're both English majors?

E: English and French - I'm sort of a double major. (First year teacher - female.)

R: Yes, I'm English. (First year teacher - female.)

Interviewer: What was your minor?

R: History.

Interviewer: English and French and English and history. Well, do you have any comments about preparation in those areas?

E: I think it's really nice to study 18th century, 20th century literature, but I'm wondering, in retrospect, I'm wondering, even projecting, when I'll ever see it again. (First year teacher - female.)

R: We have both said, I think, that to keep your mind alert and to keep up intellectually we both would like to start taking night courses. We realize we'll never probably be able to combine the two - the higher echelon of literature courses that we experience and what we are teaching, but to keep ourselves sharp and alert we do both want to take the classes at night and I think if you are able to you can bring in some of your literature experiences with a few of the more aware classes. But the lack of reading is primary . . . . I think most of the colleges are realizing this; the lack of basic skills - what happens in the reading process, grammar, the archaic approaches to grammar. (First year teacher - female.)

E: Well, we don't know how to do it, because nobody ever told us. As a result we are reluctant, in fact almost fearful to teach grammar as such in the classroom. (First year teacher - female.)

Interviewer: Now for a moment think about the preparation in your major, which is social studies in both cases. In retrospect now, do you have any comments on your preparation there as far as your command of content, anything about the instruction, the curriculum in your major that prepared you or did not prepare you for what you are doing now?

S: I think the guidelines, as far as taking things for teaching in secondary schools, are very, very general because you can pick and choose almost what you want, and if you pick and choose the wrong subjects you can go into a public school not prepared to teach any of the history that is offered there. It depends on what you want. I took quite a bit in U.S. History, so I feel adequate to teach U.S. History; I don't consider myself as expert, but adequate. I only had two courses in World History, so if they ever give me a "World History and Geography" course I'm going to be poorly prepared for it, because I was not required to take more than one or maybe two classes and I took one more than I was supposed to at that time. The guidelines are fairly flexible so that you pick and choose what you want as I said before. I think maybe that the Education Department could put out some kind of a brochure where they would suggest or even let you know early in the program when you first start, maybe your second or third year, what type of courses are being taught and what your emphasis, what they suggest your emphasis, should be. Then you could take proper courses. But the courses I did take were from very fine professors and I don't feel that I was gypped at all in any of the courses; it was just that perhaps some of my selections were not as wise as they could have been for teaching in the public schools. (First year teacher - female.)

Attitudes Toward Teaching Disadvantaged Adolescents:

It is generally agreed throughout the literature in professional education that changes in attitudes represent a central objective of all educational endeavors. Attitudinal changes are also the most difficult to measure. Usually, they must be inferred or secured from indirect measures. What attitudes were apparent in the comments of the interviewes? What seemed to be the depth of their commitment at this relatively early stage of their careers? Here is what they had to say.

Interviewer: A, sometime back when you had to write an autobiography you put down this sentence: "I feel that because of my strong interest I can meet the challenge offered in education, but because I am personally concerned and involved in the striving of the Negro I will probably be just a little too easy on the students, but this I will work on and learn through my student teaching." Do you still feel that way?

A: Definitely not. Gee, I can't imagine . . . Maybe it was because I didn't have the contact with the students. No, I feel I will probably have the problem of being too hard on them; most definitely. And that is for the same reason - because I am a Negro and because I'm interested in building up the different types of self-images in my students. I'll probably be too forceful maybe. If I can temper the first with what I now think, then maybe I can reach a happy medium. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

Interviewer: A, what caused you to change your attitude from a fear that you were going to be too lenient to now a feeling that you're going to possibly exact too high a standard?

A: I can't pinpoint the reason but I can probably tell you what it was tied in with. One of the things - well, in context with the recent riot - that is, the 1965 riot - many people were saying that this community is oppressed. The people do not have this opportunity and that opportunity, and as a result of this riot this was on the lips of every Negro in the community . . . in and out of the community. We had several discussions in our home, and my husband and I came to the conclusion that anybody in California, as far as we know California, can get an education. You just don't need money. We did not have money. My family didn't have money for quite awhile and I got my education on my own - working and going to school. I don't feel that these students should do the same thing because I did it, but I do feel that they can do it. So why should I pamper them into thinking that they can't? This is what came out during the riot. They felt like they couldn't. They had been told that they couldn't so they were completely satisfied! Now I want to show them that they can; show them how they can and I want to see them do it, without any hand holding - without me taking them by the hand, and without me taking them by the apron-strings. I want to see them get out on their own. I want the future of the young Negro in America to be that of an individual rather than - back to B - collective or cooperative effort of the whole, entire family, because sometimes it doesn't work. I want the individual to realize his value and his worth and to do something about it. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

B: I'll go along with that. Helping an individual to understand his own personal worth and dignity and that although he may never rise above his economical level, from rags to riches, in a lifetime, he can be a better person to himself. He can adjust to society. Society won't necessarily change overnight in any situation, but adjust to the things that are coming about and in doing so be of more help to himself and his community and live a better life. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

A: The Friday before "Negro History Week" I got the word from my Master Teacher that I should think of doing something in terms of Negro history for that week, and I thought and I thought, but I couldn't think of anything. The real reason was because I didn't want to think of anything. . . I didn't want to separate it. At Jordan they have a beautiful display in the main hall and it says "Famous American Negroes." To me this same display could be there - well, it's a picture of various contemporary Americans - and the words could read "Famous Americans" and it would have the same meaning, and it should have the same meaning. I think the students would respect themsleves a little bit more if we didn't designate them as hyphenated Americans - that is Negro-Americans. There should be no hyphenation there. A Negro born in America is an American period! And this is what I'd like to get across to them - a respect for themselves which they do not have. We had a bull session in our class once - this was during my 493 . . . or 411 participation-observation - and I was trying to get the students to understand that demonstrations, violence, and so forth are not helping the cause. This was before the Watts Riots ever occurred - before it was even thought of. So I asked one student "Bob, what would you do" this was not his name - "Bob, what would you do?" and his first reaction was "Well, if somebody told me I couldn't have a job or I couldn't eat next to them, I'd punch them in the mouth." And I said, - "What would you think if that same person" -

naturally a Caucasian, "What do you think that same person would do if you told him he couldn't eat next to you?" He said "Uh . . . I don't know." I said "He'd talk to you about it. He'd speak English and you'd be afraid!; you'd be scared to death because you cannot speak English to him." Yeah, well you told me all I speak is English! "That's not English, Bob. This is what I'm trying to teach you now - English, how to talk to people and how to be on the same level with people and the only medium we have in common is English - our language. So stop trying to demonstrate for them and just talk with them." In my class I have one girl now who said she felt very uncomfortable around white people, and I said, "White teachers also?" and she said, "Yes, I just don't like to be around them, because I don't know what to say to them." I said, "That's your problem right there. Next time you have your English class you read that book as hard as you can because that is the only place you're going to learn how to talk to them. And you won't feel uncomfortable anymore. As a matter of fact you'll feel like they're part of your family or just another friend." This is the thing I'd like to get across to these students and maybe I have too much fire and energy about it. But I don't believe idlers in the street will ever afford us anything. And I don't believe that discriminating in American History will ever bring about the respect or the pride in the community which we're trying to bring out by these Negro History Week sessions. I think they'd have more self-confidence if they had better English, and as Bob said, we have to fight the system - the established code of the community, like, you know, sit around and worry about these things, but it's now becoming that this is not the majority. Maybe it's 50-50, but I find that a lot of students are much more interested in themselves as Negroes, and going out and making something of themselves as Negroes. Even the student who does belong to this fringe group, even he is asking questions and that's helping in a sense that he is concerned. He has now become concerned with this even if he's not going to learn anything about it. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

The response of another candidate, white Caucasian, is also of interest.

R: Frankly, I never knew Watts was on the map; I never knew we had a so-called Los Angeles ghetto. I had to ask my husband where Jefferson and Jordan were when I signed up, and I said, "Jefferson - I wonder where this is." And when I went at Markham I know I was just looking from side to side. At first when I looked on the exterior it didn't seem maybe as bad as I thought it would. I know that first day when I drove up the street to get in the parking lot my whole heart was in my stomach. These big boys on either side, and I thought, "I wonder if I'm going to make it through the gate, oh pitter patter!" I did, and after that I must say I wasn't aware of anything . . . color nothing; I don't see that at all anymore.

E: I knew Watts and I knew Los Angeles. I . . . well I just knew it was there. I had always been bothered by the fact that it was there and when I saw that there was a possibility to teach down there I was, frankly, reinterested in teaching. I graduated, I had a B.A., but what could I do? I was, in a sense . . . well teaching was the only thing. So I went into teaching. But when this program was presented I was really anxious. I wanted to do something, I wanted to do something for the world! (First year teacher - female.)

R: We feel we're doing something and we want to help make more of it, but it's . . . oh, you see these tired teachers, and it's that way everywhere, but - I don't know - there's an advantage. E and I think of when we met Ed S., one of the teachers. We were at the in-service program. We were asked to stand up and identify ourselves and when they said "Jordan," E and I thought we were the only poor things going there, and we stood up and we looked aroung and here is this tall, Eastern-to-the-teeth young man, blond, standing at the back looking around, and we said hello to him briefly; then we went out afterwards. He was going to Jordan too. Well, he had come just before the rioting and he was about ready to board the next plane back, and we said, "Oh no!" He said, "You both are crazy, you females are just crazy; aren't you afraid?" I said, "No, we're so excited!" And we told him we've had this preparation and we felt there was no better place to teach. We had all this attention, all this money coming in. It's the only place to be. You're the focus of educational interest now; I mean there's no . . . this is the thing at a school like we are at. We would never have been in the position we are now in an ordinary school. Because the teachers are what they are and because there's such a drop-out rate, we have chances to advance so much more in experience, so much more than we would in an ordinary school. We mentioned the idea of experimenting in terms of making a curriculum for the lower grades. In other words, they want our ideas. (First year teacher - female.)

Social Stratification Among Students:

R: The social level - they're not all - they're disadvantaged maybe as far as money. We still have our social levels within the school. They're not all one whole at all. There are students that refuse to associate with another - the student body officers, this sort of thing. They have no contact with the lower part of the school. They have no say so. They're just as separate, as apart, and just because you think it's all one color you feel it's all the same. Some of these children perhaps didn't have money, but they would have been elsewhere if it hadn't been for their financial situation. This is what's bad when you first come in; you think you're teaching them all on this level. There are students you have to prod and pull in your accelerated classes that are just like the lazy bumpkins in the other schools; but you hear many of the Negro teachers saying to them, "I was disadvantaged, I had to sit up nights burning the midnight oil, I had to struggle to get where I am." I feel they face more pressure than many of the Caucasian-school children in a middle class school, because they must prove it to their race and to themselves. There is such a pressure for Negro leadership now in other ways that they must make the classroom. The more capable ones do not want to hear this; they want to learn. (First year teacher - female.)

Adjusting to Racial Differences:

R: You have to coin this phrase; everytime you go it's a new one. We have a new teacher who's an interesting contrast for us, who has come in without any preparation, who has a conglomeration of classes. But he has beautiful bulletin boards and lots of visual aids up on the board. He uses quite a bit of pop stuff and the Negro-Caucasian bit. It's all racial. The terms in his vocabulary are all related to the racial tones, talk in school about what we're going to do to get ahead or what it's like, and many magazine issues that illustrate how the Negroes are getting ahead and many pictures using only Negroes, so on and so forth, It's all very pointed. The kids are tired of hearing about it. I was interested to observe it and in a way I'm glad he went ahead with it because it helps you. They don't want to hear it. They're tired of it. They are just like everyone else. (First year teacher - female.)

E: They want to be treated like . . . they're tired of being special, and they know it's because . . . especially since the riots, there have been so many people asking so many questions about so many things that they . . . you know, so what's the big deal in answering the questions? So the minute you switch into this vein, I think, they see you in a completely different light. I mean, you're not treating them then as just a student in a classroom that you want to have learn something, but you're treating them as a Negro student and as a cause kind of thing. You have to be careful. In other words, "Am I really being careful because you're a Negro or am I just concerned because you're a student who has a need that I can help fill?" And, I think, you have to really establish immediately with your class the fact that "You're Negro and I'm white; okay - but this isn't the point here. The point here is that I am a teacher and you are a student. I have something that you need to learn." If I can communicate to them the need that they have to learn what I can teach them, then fine. If I have to . . . if I use Negro kind of resources, you know, to bring it in, to make it meaningful to them, fine. But that's not the point. (First year teacher - female.)

R: You're concerned with this, I think, at the beginning. I don't know, my background was terribly sheltered and, of course, I was very self-conscious and my . . . nothing at the college could have prepared you for this; you have to experience this yourself, talking with the teachers, with other Negro members of our group when we first started. I would ask them silly questions like "What do you feel as a person who is lighter skinned?" This sort of thing that you don't know, that you need to establish and I know in this way Mr. S was terribly helpful to me so that I got over my self-consciousness before I began teaching. Color was no longer a "thing" and I'm completely unconscious of it; absolutely, except when I went to the Huntington Library and I noticed that I was the only blonde Caucasian . . . and I could feel people staring, but other than that no consciousness whatever of it. I do find, however, I am not poised enough when I bring up the topic in class - perhaps it had advantages - I can't be as casual as I would like to so I really do avoid that for now. I don't want to bring it up when they can feel in my voice I'm having trouble bringing up the topic. They'll joke in class. You find yourself surprised at . . . "Oh, Joyce is more light-skinned; we'll let her play the Madonna in the play." But once you get these things out and over with, it helps you adjust. Nothing in the preparations at college could help you in this respect, but it's such an education in that way. I think, I expressed to many people that I have never been in a situation where I have learned as much as I've taught. This is difficult in teaching. We still have friends, surprising enough, who I thought were so liberal. I receive so much pressure from people and I know E did immediately after the riots. "You're not going down there!" and "You're not going to teach there after your husband is away!" and "You don't go down there tonight!" This bothers you more than anything. It's not that different and that special. But you ask yourself what is it all coming to if people still on the whole feel this way about this situation? (First year teacher - female.)

E: I found in my classes after ten, eleven weeks or so, when they feel they know you - like I had a student one day in class, oh, I don't know what brought it up, but he said to me, "Miss F, did you know where Jordan was when you signed up to teach?" I said, "Yes, I student-taught here in my first semester, right next door to that room over there." "You did?" And I said, "Yes." So one student said, "Did they make you teach in this school or can you choose?" I said, "Well, if you sign up early enough you can choose; sometimes they sort of send you where they want you to go." So they said, "What about you? Did you choose?" And I said, "Yes, I chose; I wanted to come here." They said, "Didn't the riots scare you?" And I said, "I knew my students weren't rioting; I knew the students at Jordan weren't out there throwing bottles and bricks." And one of the kids said, "Well, I was scared!" (First year teacher - female.)

Discipline:

Interviewer: Has discipline been a bugaboo at all? I know that many, many student teachers comment on discipline.

S: I think, too much emphasis is put on it. That's my own personal opinion. I haven't found any problems. As long as you can . . . you have rapport with the students, which I think is a necessary characteristic if you are going to be any kind of a successful teacher and I don't mean a great teacher, but if you are going to be a teacher and make it, you've got to have some kind of rapport with the students. And if you've got rapport with the students, then you should be able to handle them . . . the discipline is secondary. I don't think it should be made the primary factor that too many people make it. (First year teacher - female.)

J: I'll agree with this, S. (male.)

S: And it can scare the heck out of you because at one point, after all the talking at school in the college classes and stuff about discipline and discipline and discipline, and some professors really stress that it is more important than anything else in the classroom, you start to feel a little wobbly - my God, what about discipline - whereas before you were very confident. Then you start thinking . . . you have second thoughts . . . "Well, will I make it?" It's a bunch of baloney. (Second year teacher - female.)

Interviewer: Are there any problems with the other type - the excessively withdrawn student or the students who will not respond or become involved?

F: The ones that don't try, and sit there and waste time . . . and you try everything - being nice, threatening . . . they don't care about grades so that doesn't make any difference and then pretty soon it's just . . . I found myself yesterday - one boy everytime he . . ." shut up, shut up, shut up, shut up! Just like that, because all he was doing was talking back. You can't make him work. He won't work. I can't reach him. Now maybe he's beyond reaching. But when you get a whole classroom like that with only maybe three or four who can be reached, you're not teaching, you're just keeping them quiet for an hour. It's a small enough class that I should be able to work with them and reach them but either, as I say, they're unreachable or I don't know enough techniques or there's some problem there. Most of them, of course, have more than one problem. They don't just have a problem in Art. They won't just sit in that class. They also can't read, they can't write. Education for them has been a negative thing and it's getting more negative all the time. They're discipline problems because we can't make them do anything, and if they're not doing anything, pretty soon they start to disturb other people. If they're withdrawn, I think in Art I have a better chance of helping them, because when everybody else is working and they're just sitting there I can tell when a child is tense and tied up in himself or he's just sitting there lollygagging. If he's withdrawn, I have found that I can go over and work with him. I say, "Well try; I don't expect you to be an artist, but let's try. I can draw this line, now you draw the line." This type of thing - where I can get through to them because Art is kind of a therapy. But I don't know what you do about the kids that don't try. And, it seems like in our school there's more of them than there is of the other. That's the big problem. (First year teacher - female.)

Understanding the Community:

The importance of understanding the home background and the community was identified in some way by nearly all of the interviewees. Both explicitly and implicitly, the respondents were suggesting that effective instruction demanded a much greater contact with the outside environmental forces than was generally required of prospective teachers. Even the more varied and extensive field experiences of the candidates in Project TEACH did not reveal adequate recognition of this need. Selected comments follow:

B: In teaching in the Watts area where there are low incomes, and more or less poverty-ridden families, there's something that exists there that doesn't anywhere else. This is the fact that in the home many of the families are rather large and there's a tendency for everyone to cooperate, everyone to pitch in and do his best. Then when you come in the classroom all of a sudden you enter an atmosphere of competition and the whole aspect of getting along and trying to help each other is turned into competing against each other. Many of these students don't respond as well in this situation. They don't see the real value of competition and how it will be affecting them in their later lives. I don't really know how you can circumvent that problem in the home. If it's in the home then there's something instilled in them and they will bring it to class, bring it to school . . . . (Student teacher - Negro male.)

Interviewer: Many prospective teachers probably have an even more serious problem than you have in overcoming this and being more sensitive to home surroundings, community surroundings. Do you have any ideas on the kind of experiences that prospective teachers or even teachers in service - teachers already on the job - might find valuable in helping them this way, helping them learn more about the home, learn more about the background of the students? Should they - for example - would it be helpful to have some experiences in the community as part of teacher education?

B: I don't think that teachers should be social workers or anything of this type, but I think they should take an interest in the community; see just what type of community it is. There are certain parts of the Negro community that are different from other parts. You might have a slightly higher economic level. This makes a difference. This affects the student. He usually will act and respond differently. These things are good for a teacher to know. Maybe come to the local YOB, Youth Opportunities Board, and maybe to some of the other community meetings, PTA meetings and see how the parents respond. Of course you can't forget the one-to-one relationship of counseling of certain students and in some way finding out just how their home life really is. This would take quite a bit of time - we couldn't do it for everyone but some of the students who have problems - they are more or less usually generalized throughout. Their problems are probably like most of the colored students' problems. (Student teacher - Negro male.)

A: I also think it is important that the in-service teacher or prospective teacher of a Negro area in particular or any other minority group area, that they have some type of practical experience in the area. I know I run into a conflict with my statements. I don't want them to be social workers either because we have enough work trying to be teachers, but you cannot understand these students even if you are a Negro. Negroes themselves have trouble understanding other Negroes insofar as our college life is quite different from our high school life or those students' life right there in that particular community. Watts is quite different from the community of Compton that I grew up in, and I should go to church in Watts one day and see what the Minister is telling the students or the parents of the students, and I should see this so that maybe I could understand them better; maybe I could approach them better if I

> understood this. It would take an awful lot of time and I'm sorry about this. I wish there were more time, but I think it's necessary time, and I have made plans. I have made plans to go to a church in the Watts area, as a matter of fact the church right across the street from Jordan, for this purpose - this express purpose. (Student teacher - Negro female.)

Responses from the other candidate were very similar.

In-Service Education:

Additional comments were related to in-service education. Several of the beginning teachers placed great emphasis upon the need for a more thorough orientation. They were especially concerned about the location of instructional materials and audio-visual aids available in the school. English teachers, in particular, referred to the need for curriculum materials "on a lower level."

> E: You have to know where these persons are . . . where can you come across things like tape recorders, where can you come across things like this poetry that they will respond to. In other words, it seems that we spent too much time simply running down and tracking down things to use in the classroom successfully and how much time can you spend on this when you also have the stack of papers that gets higher and you want to give the students an immediate return in terms of feedback, showing them where they made their mistakes and this kind of thing, and here you are, you're spending time running down materials, you're spending time correcting things. In fact, sometimes it seems as if there's simply not enough time and something will suffer from it. One day it's the lesson planning and one day it's the correcting of the papers, and one day it's simply the . . . . (First year teacher - female.)
>
> Interviewer: I want to get back to one other idea - you mentioned earlier that you needed more familiarity and more time to develop the curriculum on a lower level, the curriculum for a not-so-able student. If you were given released time now for, say a summer institute or part of a day, do you think that you could develop curriculum that would make sense for the kind of student that you are dealing with?
>
> E: Well, I certainly think that both R and I have developed definite ideas about what these students need, where the greatest need is, and what, simply as English teachers, we feel is the greatest area of concentration. And I think that if we had more time we really could sit down and go through texts, go through materials and really organize something that would be worthwhile. Because once you're in this situation and working with the students . . . I don't really have any trouble getting along with them: I come into the classroom and generally they respond to me as a person. It's simply a matter of getting to them what they can achieve with, and I think if I had time I really could do it. Maybe it's an excuse to fall back on, but I really do feel it and I know R and I talked about it quite a bit at Jordan because we both have the same kind of classes and have the same kind of problems. (First year teacher - female.)

R: We definitely are very strong in this and Mr. S gave us the go-ahead to approach the other teachers. We've hesitated because we felt we were new, we had no business speaking out and we thought, "Well, certainly someone else has come up with this problem or has ideas." and we felt rather humble to be setting out what students should learn when we never knew . . . this was our first semester, but we've come to find out that no one really cares and I guess a humble opinion is better than none. So, I haven't had any background in reading, I haven't had any background in speech, but I feel some start is better than none and I think in pooling our own intuitive feelings about the matter that we'll come up with something that gives the child a stabilizing force. We are first told when we arrive, "You must have a stable situation in the room as far as well-planned lessons and agenda, being prepared to meet any situations because the child comes to school expecting stability that he does not get at home. If he meets with a situation that is unstable, that there is noise, discipline is not consistent, then they go to pieces because they are not getting what they expect and they treat it just as they would this situation at home." But, we feel this need so trememdously, no one else has really, I guess. (First year teacher - female.)

Summary Interpretation:

What can be inferred from such comments? Perhaps the most obvious inference is that prospective and beginning teachers have a need to be heard. The first-hand contact with the world of the disadvantaged and with teaching as a profession has filled them to the point of overflow. There is a high state of readiness. They have experienced life through the eyes of the teaching novice. They want to talk about their classes, about their schools, about their preparation, about themselves. And, more important, they do have something to say. All but one of the interviewees exhibited an unusually high degree of idealism. They have obviously identified themselves with a mission, a cause about which they have deep feeling. The Hawthorne effect is everywhere. They are part of a special program. And they feel special. If their reactions are typical, it can be said without equivocation that at least one objective of the Project TEACH has been realized. They have acquired a positive identification with the problems of the disadvantaged: the school in a disadvantaged neighborhood is perceived as a professionally and personally desirable place to be.

They view on-site work in teaching techniques and methods as an improvement over the more conventional on-campus instruction. At the same time, they offer clues that field experiences might effectively be extended to more than one school and possibly to a contrasting socioeconomic area. In retrospect, they see a need for some first-hand contact in the life of the community. The exact form such experiences should take is understandably left to the professional staff of the teacher-training institution.

The stereotype of the disadvantaged adolescent is being exploded. Several respondents referred to social levels and to individual differences within the schools. And, they are acquiring something of a healthy disdain for the labels of "culturally deprived," "disadvantaged," and so forth. They are identifying the central issue not as black vs white or as advantaged vs disadvantaged but as teaching and learning.

"The point here is that I am a teacher and you are a student. I have something that you need to learn. If I can communicate to them the need that they have to learn what I can teach them, then fine."

An encouraging but not an atypical comment from a first year teacher.

They are telling us once again what an exceptional teacher that experience can be. Experiences in the school have sharpened their perceptions, influenced their attitudes, and made them more aware. As with so many other follow-up inquiries, they are reminding teacher educators that somehow, some way, experience must be much more related to theory in all aspects of the program.

Thus, transcending all of the values in terms of securing evaluative data for program improvement is the attitude that has been instilled in the candidates themselves. One of the candidates sums it up this way:

> "People have asked us 'Are you coming back?' Well, it's not something you run back to in terms of, I don't know, sheer joy, but I couldn't leave it behind . . . Certainly you get the junk and the guff and the hate, but also you get such extreme acceptance and love and warmth . . . I see my kids - at least five of them are missing part of a front tooth; I see a black eye out here and a lovely little girl who yesterday had seemed so light and gay and you don't know if she was beaten up by someone, what happened on the way home or what. Because they see this, they write so vividly. Their grammar may not be good, but what they see of life, they can write beautifully. A middle class child is restrained in his feelings about sex and some of these other responses to life that they would never put on paper for you. So that experience, it would seem I don't know, it would seem colorless and drab to go into another situation now. I couldn't do it, I don't think."

CHAPTER 4 - WORKING WITH PUBLIC SCHOOL FACULTIES

The Conventional Program

There appears to be little question that the quality of field experiences such as on-site course work, student teaching, and internships depends largely upon the quality of the training staffs in the public schools. The CSCLA's Supervising Teacher's Guide Book explains it this way:

> The selection of the supervising teacher is undoubtedly of the utmost significance. If the supervising teacher possesses keen perceptions of the learners and of the self-concept in influencing behavior; if he has enthusiasm plus advanced scholarship in his subject specialties, the student teacher will have one kind of experience. If he does not have any of these or has them in a very limited degree, the student teacher will have another kind of experience. (p. 11)

The importance of placing the prospective teacher with a carefully selected mentor has been emphasized so often that it will serve little purpose to belabor the point here. The fact that "training teachers" occupy a crucial position in the preparation of the novice has been well established. The more productive area of inquiry is the method by which such teachers can be selected and prepared.

In the conventional teacher-education program at CSCLA, college instructors and teacher-education candidates have their initial contact with classroom teachers during the Ed. 411 course in general methods and evaluation. All students enrolled in this course are required to complete a minimum of three class periods per week in "participation-observation" activities.. The "cooperating teachers" are generally assigned or selected from volunteers by the principal or his delegate. Although it is recommended that participating-observers space their visits on three separate days of one period each, there are frequent deviations to accommodate students with special scheduling problems or off-campus work responsibilities. While there are exceptions, it is generally true that Ed. 411 instructors have very limited contact with the cooperating teachers and that there are few in-service activities for public school faculties who work with participating observers.

A great variety of schools are used and participating observers are exposed to an even larger variety of teachers. It is not unusual, for example, for a college instructor to have 25 or more students assigned to at least an equal number of cooperating teachers scattered in three or more schools.

The cooperating teacher does not receive any pay nor does the college instructor receive provision in his staffing schedule for travel and personal conferences beyond those necessary for effecting the essential administrative arrangements. Under such conditions, personal conferences between college instructors and cooperating teachers are both difficult and unlikely.

Ed. 411 instructors do attempt to relate formal instruction in their course work to a candidate's experiences in the training schools. Generally, college students are required to keep a diary or "log" of their activities, and some time is set aside for group discussion. An end-of-semester reaction sheet is completed by the cooperating teacher for each candidate assigned to him and submitted to the college instructor. Nevertheless, the great variety of training situations poses a serious instructional obstacle to meaningful group discussions.

The comparatively low rating of orientation and follow-up of participation-observation activities in the regular college class is shown in the following data. As part of a study of student teacher reactions, each of 242 student teachers was asked to rank the various aspects of his participation-observation experience on a four-point scale with a rating of 4 being the highest possible rating.

Reaction to the Participation-Observation Experience*

	Composite Rating	Rank
Association with Secondary school students	3.36	1
Observation of teaching by coop. teacher	3.09	2
School Activities required in the schools	2.81	3
Orientation and follow-up received in the college class	2.65	4
Over-all reaction to the experience	3.3	

(*Taken from "Reactions of Secondary Student Teachers to Preparation in Education Courses" Department of Secondary Education, p. 14.)

It is clear from these figures that orientation and feedback in the regular college class receives a relatively low ranking by the responding student teachers. Yet, it is significant to note that prospective teachers consider the participation-observation activities to be among the most valuable in their total professional preparation program. The over-all rating of 3.3 is second only to student-teaching in an over-all listing of most valuable Education courses.

Directed teaching assignments usually follow completion of Ed. 411 and the participation-observation experience. However, for some candidates there may be one or more intervening semesters due to the difficulty of meeting eligibility requirements for student teaching. Directed teaching assignments are typically requested for three hundred or more students in a large number of schools. A candidate may or may not be placed in the same school in which he served as a participant observer depending upon a variety of factors such as the availability of supervising teachers, the number of assignments a particular school principal will accept, the geographical proximity to the campus, and so forth. Unlike the participation-observation situation, supervising teachers do receive some token remuneration and supervisors do receive staffing credit for school visitation and personal conferences.

Changes Introduced by Project TEACH

In contrast to the regular program just described, Project TEACH has attempted to focus much more attention upon the role of public schools and their faculties. The major innovation of moving the general methods course (Ed. 411) off the college campus into a selected public school set the stage for many additional changes. For example, prospective teachers found it much easier to increase the amount of their participation observation. Since they were already required to be in the public school for enrollment in the required Education course, it was not difficult to extend the regular three-hours-per-week of "participation-observation" activities to ten and fifteen hours per week. Similarly, where participant-observers in the regular program were often scattered among several schools, all college students enrolled in Project TEACH observed in one school, or at most, two schools with ten weeks of intensive on-site work completed in each school. Upon completion of Ed. 411 eligible teacher education candidates generally requested and received student teaching in the same school.

Orientation of Training Staff:

An especially important change was the much more extensive provision for orientation of the public school training faculties. The following report submitted by Elsa May Smith, Assistant Professor of Education and co-director of Project TEACH outlines the steps which were taken to orient the college students and the public school staff.

Project TEACH: Secondary Student
Participation-Observation Procedures

Project TEACH plans called for taking thirty students preparing for teaching careers into Markham Junior High and into Jordan Senior High for a semester of work in classroom participation and training. Certain steps were necessary to insure the success of the program.

Preparation of the college students (September 1965)

1. Before taking the class into the school, the college instructor spent several class periods in discussing the purposes of the experiences, the plan of operation, the nature of the community, the organization of the school and the salient features of the student body. Special emphasis was placed upon working relationships and the spirit in which the work was to be carried out. Lines of authority and responsibility were clearly drawn.

Preparation of the faculty (September 1965)

1. The Director and two secondary co-directors of Project TEACH met with the principal of each school. At these meetings the over-all plan of operation was developed.
2. The college instructor, a co-director of Project TEACH attended a meeting with each principal and his administrative staff in which the college participation-observation program was explained, questions answered, and areas of responsibility clearly defined. Questions were raised and answered.

3. Each principal called a meeting of his entire faculty to which the college instructor was invited to explain the participation-observation program. Again, responsibility and authority of all concerned was made clear. It was emphasized that the program was a cooperative one - a mutually advantageous program where only teachers who wished would be given a participating-observer.

Participant-Observer Entrance Into School (Early October)

1. The college class of thirty participants met at Jordan High School for a two hour orientation period. On that occasion several members of the administration staff spoke about the history of the school, the nature of the community, the school curriculum, and the provision made for student guidance.
2. The college students were introduced to faculty responsible for special areas such as attendance, library, and counseling. Each student was given a faculty handbook and considerable additional reading material about both school and community.
3. Student leaders of the secondary school were introduced and served as guides to show the "visitors" about the campus.
4. Every effort was made to make the college students feel needed and wanted.
5. The following day the college class of participating observers met at Markham Junior High where a two hour orientation period similar to the one held at Jordan took place.

Entrance of college students into classrooms (Early October)

1. Each principal made it clear that only those teachers who indicated a desire to have a participating-observer would be assigned one.
2. The college supervisor supplied a list of suggested activities in which college students might be expected to participate. This list was given to both teachers and college students.
3. Either the principal, vice-principal, or college supervisor introduced the college student to the cooperating teacher, with whom he was assigned to work.

Follow-up

1. At the end of a two week period each principal met with the cooperating teachers in his school to ascertain how the program was working, to make certain that students were getting professionally significant experiences, and to iron out any difficulties encountered.
2. The college supervisor checked with each college student to make certain that observations were meaningful and that opportunities to work with students were being made available.
3. At mid-term each cooperating teacher turned in an evaluation report for his participating-observer and each student participant handed his college instructor a log of his observation and activities within the school.
4. At the end of the semester the cooperating teachers again evaluated the participating-observers and the students turned in reports of their observations and activities.

Throughout the semester the college supervisor met frequently with the school principals, conferred informally with cooperating teachers, and advised with college students. Lines of communication were kept open.

* * * * *

Transition to Student Teaching:

The transition to student teaching has also been greatly improved under Project TEACH. When teacher-education candidates complete a semester with ten to fifteen hours per week in a training school, they inevitably come to feel knowledgeable and comfortable in their surroundings. They become informed about school routines, the availability of materials, the policies associated with discipline, attendance, use of cumulative records, and the like. More important, they have an opportunity to establish positive working relationships with the faculty and administration. The change from participant-observer to student teacher thus becomes a natural transition and there is much less apprehension than is customary for student teachers under the regular program. The advantage of close articulation between the on-site course work and student teaching is emphasized in this comment from a first-year teacher who had recently completed the requirements of the project:

> S: I think a definite advantage of the program that I was in was that I got to know the school and the people in the school as well as the students, so that when I went to do my student teaching I felt very comfortable and very much at home. I was a little nervous about my teaching, but I knew people there and I felt very much at home and comfortable. I knew my way around the school, and I think it helps an awful lot. I knew what kind of students I would have; it made it a lot more comfortable for me, a lot more secure. I knew where I was going, what I was going to do. It wasn't just strange; it wasn't that I was taken from another world and just plopped here all of a sudden. I think that is very valuable; because I think in the regular program, from other people I've spoken to, you don't have any familiarity with the school until you are all of a sudden put there for student teaching. Then not only is the school strange but the teaching is strange, the kids are strange, and the whole thing is different; whereas I was very comfortable in the situation, it made it much easier, more conducive to teaching.

In-Service Education:

An outgrowth of the close working relationships established with public school administration and the classroom teachers was an evident need for in-service education. Excerpts taken from the Progress Report for Project TEACH compiled on June 4, 1965, are relevant.

> The problems of supervising teachers centered around:
> a. An over-supervision attitude on the part of some, and a "sink-or-swim" attitude on the part of others. Supervising teachers must realize that they are part of an educative process at the college level.

b. Being threatened by visitations and the student teacher's presence. They need to be trained toward a cooperative attitude rather than a reaction attitude.
c. Worrying about the energetic changes student-teachers wish to make in the existing status-quo. A few of the supervising teachers eagerly sought these new ideas, but some in-service work must be begun.
d. Unrealistic criteria in grading student teachers. We suspect that beginning supervisors are usually prone to be too rigorous in evaluating. There seemed to be more of this attitude in Watts than elsewhere.

Interviews with college students who had completed the project and with supervising teachers re-enforced further the need for the Project staff to assume leadership in initiating or assisting with in-service activities. The interviews also helped the staff to realize that they could greatly strengthen the program by capitalizing upon the skills of outstanding faculty members and that the services of the more successful teachers might be made more generally available to prospective supervising and cooperating teachers. An excerpt from an interview with two Project TEACH candidates illustrates the importance which the insecure novice places upon sympathetic guidance from his supervisor.

> Interviewer: Let me ask you a question . . . in your student teaching, the supervising teacher, the actual teacher in the school under whom you work, is extremely important. Let's say that, theoretically, you had a group of supervising teachers in front of you - knowing what you know now, having been a student teacher, what would you want to say to them? (A first and second year teacher.)
>
> J: Actually, I'll speak again honestly because I was very fortunate with my teachers and the experiences they gave me. I think what a student teacher desires most is some confidence that the master teacher has in him. If the student teacher realizes that he will make mistakes but yet he won't be criticized in front of the class or in front of other teachers, or hear remarks about the work he does other than from the master teacher, it gives a great deal of confidence to the student teacher. He has to be the teacher. The class shouldn't know that there is another teacher in the room. Sometimes the master teacher likes to let everyone know he is still the teacher, and it takes away a lot of confidence from the student teacher. They gave me a lot of leeway but yet they were critical of some of the things I did wrong and made me feel I could go ahead and make honest mistakes without my record being messed up . . . or my rating.
>
> S: I think also the most valuable thing my supervising teachers did was to sit back and let me help the class. I did it from the first day both times, so there was never really the problem of who was the real teacher. They were always there; I knew that if I had any problem I could always go and ask the teachers. They were very easy going, casual, and I could always stay and talk to them before and after the class if I had any problems. Just knowing that I was the teacher and that they were there if I needed help and I could always go to them with my problems and not worry about being criticized harshly or anything for it.

J: One thing that I'd like to say: I was always welcome by the master teacher to watch him teach his classes. I didn't have to tell him I was coming - just go in the back and there I was, and I found that if the master teacher tells the student teacher the right way to do things, and the way that is acceptable, and yet he doesn't do them himself . . . . You get a lot more confidence when you see your master teacher doing the right things, things he tells you to do he practices himself.

The importance of relationships between new and experienced teachers compares with the student-teacher - supervising teacher relationship in its significance. Beginning teachers tend to be idealistic; they are also more impressionable than their more experienced associates. Whether these two factors combine into a positive or a negative force depends to a large extent upon the neophyte's own individual make-up, the nature of his preparation, and the quality of leadership in his school. The problem is well illustrated in an interview with one of the Project's supervising teacher who is also a department chairman.

Interviewer: Do you have any suggestions on the overall program or any part of it now, before we more into this next phase?

L: Well, may I mention one of the difficulties that we have encountered and maybe E. and R. mentioned it: whenever a new teacher comes in and begins socializing with some of the teachers who have more or less given up, those who are sour on the school and everything in it. Sometimes I think the new teachers are adversely affected. Both E & R were greatly disturbed. They would come to me time and time again with righteous indignation: "If they don't like it why do they stay?" I had warned them about it; I said, "Now listen, don't make up your minds on the basis of what you hear, but on the basis of what you see and what you experience. There will be those who will tell you everything bad about the school. Turn a deaf ear." In fact I tried to arrange their social life for them by having some of the teachers in the department act as "big sisters" so they would have someone to whom they could talk. But that is something that we have to combat, because one of our - and I don't care who knows this - one of our teachers wrote a note to one of our girls and said, "Why do you stay here? This place is nothing but a"- I don't know what it was, but it was a highly derogatory sort of thing - "Why don't you transfer?" This disturbs them. They can't understand; why do people do this? And they're enthusiastic and of course it's just a deterrent to them and the objectives that they have. I think we're losing one or two young teachers who are not in our Project TEACH because they have listened, or they couldn't make up their own minds. They are - or someone got to them and got to them very well and brainwashed them. Now, that is I don't know what in the world one could do about a situation of that kind, but that is one of the problems, one of the big problems with which they are faced. Then I think that sometimes they think the administration is going to be more or less perfect. They come in with grandiose ideas about a school that's run so beautifully. Then they find out that everyone has clay feet, you know, We're only human.

Such discussions inevitably lead to consideration of possible solutions such as formal courses, workshops, orientation materials, and the like. The workshop has a special appeal to many teachers since it suggests a more immediate and practical approach than college courses taught in the conventional manner. The possibility of initiating workshop sessions was discussed with two supervising teachers, both of whom had extensive experience in Project TEACH and were continuing to help their former charges adjust to their first year of instruction.

> Interviewer: Well, if you did have workshops, regardless of who conducted them, what kinds of things do you think should be in them? Let's say you're working with a group of prospective supervising teachers, experienced teachers who the next year will be working daily with a student teacher or an intern. Can you think of anything that would be immensely practical in such a workshop?
>
> L: This human relations factor is always very important. There are some people who just don't know how to work with student teachers, and that could be one of the units.
>
> F: Do you think, though, that a workshop or anything else is going to change them?
>
> L: No, it won't change them, but some of them just don't know their functions. I mean they would, I think, if they could, but they just don't know . . . especially if it's a new teacher. I'm not talking about those who have not been able to get along with students and who won't be able to get along with student teachers either. Some of them say "Well look, how can I approach . . . I don't want to reprimand a student teacher if he has done something wrong. How do I let him know that he is pretty far off base? I don't want to offend him. I want him to feel close to me. Now just how do I go about it?" After all, this is an adult, so if he has not been a supervisor or a department chairman he might have a little difficulty as far as that technique is concerned. So many of them in our workshop ask that question - "just how do I go about it?"
>
> S: The evaluating of the product - the work of the student teachers seems to bother some of them.
>
> L: That is another one that came up. "Suppose I have a young man or a young woman who just doesn't have it, apparently - as far as I'm concerned. What do I do about it? Do I just lower the boom, or do I connive at it - just turn my head the other way?" That's another question that did arise. Another thing I think of is this - how do you prevent your student teacher from imitating you? Now this is a good one, I think, because this has to be handled with the greatest finesse. You don't want to throw him to the wolves too soon, nor do you want him to look at you so long that he'll be a carbon copy of you. I think it takes some doing.

Staff members from Project TEACH anticipated such reactions from school personnel as the result of the experiences secured in the regular program. The need for carefully designed experiences to prepare regular classroom teachers for work as teacher-education associates had been recognized for some time. While the human-relations factor was considered of paramount importance, there was also a recognized need for equipping teachers with supervisory skills in observing, recording, interpreting, and analyzing the teaching behaviors of the beginner.

A beginning solution to the problem of in-service education was made by initiating two in-service workshops for teachers who wished to prepare themselves to serve as training teachers. Thirty-four teachers at Jordan High School and twenty teachers at Jefferson High School enrolled. The workshop for Jordan High School was held at that school to make it as convenient as possible for the staff to attend. The identical procedure was used for Jefferson High School. Leadership for the workshops came from the two secondary schools involved. The workshops were also strongly supported by the Los Angeles City Schools Administration who made it possible for the teacher participants to receive "points" or credit toward salary increases for their experiences. Resource personnel came from outstanding training teachers from the Los Angeles City Schools, from the staff of California State College at Los Angeles, and from the Los Angeles City Administration offices. Eight two-hour meetings were held for each workshop. In addition to the particular understandings or skills secured, the importance with which the Project was viewed by the teachers and the administration was also emphasized.

Classroom Teachers as Resource Personnel:

The utilization of classroom teachers as resource personnel in the teacher-education program suggests another promising method of working with public-school faculties. Feedback from college students and from supervising teachers themselves re-enforced the thinking of the Project Staff that utilization of classroom teachers beyond their common functions as supervising and cooperating teachers holds potential for strengthening the teacher-education program. A supervising teacher put it this way:

> If we could set up a system, a format whereby certain teachers who are good disciplinarians, who have a very good overall knowledge of the school would come into some of your education classes and talk and be questioned about many things. I'd like to see this structured over a period of not one lecture but many lectures on various and sundry problems. . . I might prove highly effective, and one thing, I think it would give you information directly from the source. I don't think that anyone can give information better than one who's on the firing line. Then from the standpoint of articulation, it would give the teacher some knowledge of what it's all about. In fact, it would work both ways. . . It would bring about very good articulation between the secondary school and the college.

The above sentiment, expressed by Mr. Lockett of Jordan High School, was echoed as well by several of the candidates interviewed. It was also evident in the questions raised by Co-director Elsa May Smith upon her return from attendance at institutes Project True and Gateway English which were held at Hunter College. Among the questions appearing in her report were the following:

1. Specifically, how will we involve Los Angeles City School teachers and other persons in the development of Project TEACH? (In addition to the participation-observation and supervising teacher roles which we have clearly identified. I believe this is of prime importance and should receive immediate attention.)

2. May we give considerable attention to ways in which the self concepts of teachers assigned to work with culturally handicapped children may be raised. (I suspect that only teachers whose own ego drives are reasonably satisfied will be able to raise the self concepts of the children with whom they work.)

Staff members on Project TEACH worked for teacher involvement in many ways. These included personal contact during the orientation or induction phase; occasional talks by classroom teachers and administrators to the on-site Ed. 411 class; participation by selected classroom teachers in the leadership and on-going conduct of the in-service workshops sessions, and scheduled interviews with selected supervising teachers in an attempt to secure their reactions and suggestions for improvement.

However, the utilization of classroom teachers in a systematic well structured teacher-education program must await subsequent efforts. Project TEACH went beyond the norm in teacher involvement but must also be considered short of the ideal.

Some promising ideas considered by the Project staff but awaiting exploration are: use of teacher teams with two or more teachers and a cadet or intern working in a cooperative relationships; teaching clinics in which outstanding classroom teachers demonstrate effective instructional practices for teacher-education students; use of close-circuit television and portable video-tape machines in which teaching can be "played back," analyzed, interpreted, and changed in subsequent session.

The co-director for secondary education has prepared a proposal for an N.D.E.A. summer 1967 institute for supervising teachers. It is hoped that the institute will afford an opportunity for trying out these and other promising practices.

Exchange of Instructional Materials:

The importance of timely and realistic instructional materials emerged as a study area of high priority in Project TEACH. The report submitted by Co-director Smith which was referred to earlier in connection with the Hunter College Institutes included the following inquiries:

1. Since one of the results of our Project TEACH work in the public schools will be its influence on the thinking and teaching of the public school staff in the target area schools, should we not plan to make available to the teachers materials on Urban Education reprints, annotated bibliographies, and other materials which we provide for our college students?

2. Are there materials already developed for use by and for teachers of the culturally deprived in Los Angeles City and County Schools? How do we propose to make such materials available to CSCLA staff?

These two questions pose an important challenge for any subsequent effort. Instructors of on-site courses typically complain that they must transport their personal libraries in the back seat of their automobiles. If they are fortunate, school principals are able to provide a room which is reserved for exclusive use of the Project. But even this generous offer of rare facilities does not allow for the storage and possible distribution of materials which experienced project staff members tend to accumulate. On the other hand, realistic instruction in methodology depends on the use of materials in actual use in the classrooms. Yet, district and college policies are generally quite cautious and restrictive when the use of materials by non-faculty members is being considered.

Project TEACH undoubtedly effected considerable improvement in the use of materials. But, the availability and reciprocal use of such materials is clearly an area which should not be left to chance.

Policies in this regard need careful examination with a view to facilitating exchange of materials, as well as of personnel, wherever possible and desirable. The cooperation and assistance extended by Los Angeles City Schools in this respect constitutes a model worthy of emulation in on-site efforts with other districts.

There were additional procedures which proved effective in working with public-school faculties. These included follow-up visitations and interviews with both first-year teachers and their former supervising teacher. The need for offering on-site courses in diagnostic, and remedial reading at the secondary level, possibly through extension, also appears evident. It was explained in Chapter 2 that the initial effort to add such courses did not materialize.

Whatever the form of college-training-school contacts, it seems obvious that a quality program of teacher-education depends upon the best cooperative effort within the capability of the college and training district. Further, the experience of Project TEACH supports the concept of demonstration schools in which selected secondary schools become teacher-education centers. Such centers become laboratories in which the best that is known in teacher education is explored to the mutual benefit of the teacher and student population and the training institution.

Perhaps more important, however, than any of the formal provisions for working with public-school faculties, are the close working relationships, the mutual trust and respect which develop as an incidental by-product of continuing association. College instructors and public school faculties come to know and understand one another in daily work day circumstances such as those encouraged by Project TEACH. And college students discover too that teachers are human beings who also happen to be pleasant people to be around. In such an atmosphere, the usual dread and apprehension fades. A free climate substitutes the common objective of "surviving student teaching" with a working partnership concerned with the welfare of the pupils.

CHAPTER 5 - FOLLOW UP OF PROJECT TEACH PARTICIPANTS

The Project co-director assigned to work with the prospective secondary-school teachers visited the participating schools regularly and made an effort to keep in touch with the original enrollees. The present whereabouts of only two are unknown.

Trainees Now Teaching:

Thirteen of the original Project TEACH trainees signed contracts to begin teaching in September of 1965. Only one of the thirteen indicated an interest in a teaching position outside of the Los Angeles inner-city area. Nine are currently teaching in economically disadvantaged areas of the Los Angeles City School District. Two of the nine are classified as long-term substitutes while seven have probationary status. Of the four candidates who did not sign contracts with Los Angeles City Schools, one accepted a teaching position in a correctional institution under the supervision of Los Angeles County Probation Department. The student body of that school can safely be classified as extremely disadvantaged. Another of the four participants elected to teach in a church supported school during 1965-66 and has signed a contract to begin teaching in an economically disadvantaged area of a near by school district in September 1966. And one very successful participant has been given part-time employment on the faculty of CSCLA and is working toward an advanced degree.

Four of the original group completed student teaching during the spring semester of 1966 and will be teaching in the Watts area of the Los Angeles City during 1966 and 1967. Another candidate expects to complete directed teaching during the Fall Semester of 1966 and hopes to teach in an economically disadvantaged area upon completion of credential requirements. Thus, nineteen of the original thirty-one candidates are now teaching or are anticipating teaching shortly in disadvantaged area schools. It will be recalled that eleven of the original participants were Negro, one Oriental, and twenty were Caucasians. Of the eighteen committed to teaching in disadvantaged areas, thirteen are Caucasian, four are Negro, and one is Oriental.

Where Trainees Elected to Teach:

A listing of the 19 candidates now teaching or who will be teaching by September 1966 follows:

Participant	Subject Speciality	Teaching Assignment
1.	Physical Education	CSCLA-Physical Ed. Dept. (S'66)
2.	Physical Education	El Retiro School for Girls Probation Department (F'65)
3.	English	Jordan-Los Angeles City (F'65)
4.	English	Jordan-Los Angeles City (F'65)
5.	Social Studies & Reading	Jefferson-Los Angeles City (F'65)

6.	Art & English	Bret Harte-Los Angeles City (F'65)
7.	Social Studies	Bret Harte-Los Angeles City (S'66)
8.	Auto Shop	Montebello City Schools (S'66)
9.	Biology	Coulter Academy (parochial) (F'65)
10.	Social Studies	Los Angeles City-Substitutes (F'65)
11.	Home Economics	Los Angeles City-Substitute (F'65)
12.	Social Studies	Bret Harte-Los Angeles City (S'65)
13.	Drafting	Pasteur-Los Angeles City (S'65)
14.	Social Studies	Jordan-Los Angeles City (F'66)
15.	Social Studies	Jordan-Los Angeles City (F'66)
16.	Business Education	Fremont-Los Angeles City ('66)
17.	English	Jordan-Los Angeles City ('66)
18.	Social Studies	(Summer & Fall 1966) Los Angeles City - Student Teacher
19.	Reading	Pasadena Inner City (S'66)

Trainees Not Teaching:

What of the thirteen candidates who have not entered teaching? Some observations regarding the seven Negro and six Caucasian candidates whose eventual entry into teaching careers appears doubtful would seem appropriate at this point.

One (Negro) received advancement in his position as a chemist in industry which makes a beginning teacher's salary anything but attractive. It appears that he will remain in his present position which also involves some responsibility for teaching and orienting new employees for his firm.

Two majors in mathematics (Negro) have accepted positions with I.B.M. Both indicate that they would really like to teach, but hesitate to leave present well-paying positions. One of these young men does voluntary teaching in a community center during time off from his regular job.

Five project participants, (4 Negro, 1 Caucasian) failed to meet scholarship requirements or special requirements set up by their teaching subject areas and may be lost to teaching. It should be noted that the grade point average required for eligibility for student teaching ranges from 2.3 to 3.0 or from C+ to B. Each department sets its own subject requirements and these frequently put the transfer student or the student graduate of another institution at a decided disadvantage. To add to student difficulties the requirements for securing a California Teaching Credential have been recently changed. This has been disadvantageous to many who must hold full-time jobs while attempting to qualify for credentials through college work in the Extended Day program.

One of the original participants (Caucasian) will continue her role as a mother and housewife. It would appear that any part-time work that she does outside the home in the foreseeable future will be in the secretarial field.

An opportunity to play professional football was accepted by one (Caucasian) of the prospective teachers.

One (Caucasian) is continuing his education in a midwest college and his future plans are not known to us.

One (Caucasian) with very high scholarship and leadership received his B.A. in June 1966. With major college emphasis in Art and Physical Education, he may continue to prepare for a career in teaching. At any rate it will be at least one more year before he can meet California credential requirements. He is known to have applied for Teacher Corps assignment for the Fall, 1966.

One (Caucasian) was very early asked to withdraw from the program. The young man had a psychology major and a chemistry minor. He had a high scholarship record but did not meet eligibility requirements. His whereabouts are not known to the Project staff.

In summary, of the thirteen candidates who have not entered teaching, four were attracted to other more lucrative positions outside of teaching. Five candidates failed to meet the scholarship or special subject requirements set by the various departments of the college. These candidates will have an opportunity to raise their gradepoint averages or to take additional courses. Their future plans as teachers must be classed as uncertain. Two are continuing their education, one outside of the State, and will likely enter teaching although this cannot be said with certainty at this writing. One participant will continue her role as housewife while another was asked to withdraw by the college staff. A summary listing of the non-teaching participants follows together with a short commentary.

Participant	Subject Specialty	Observations
1.	Physical Science	Employed as Chemist
2.	Mathematics	Employed by I.B.M.
3.	Mathematics	Employed by I.B.M.
4.	Social Studies	Low Scholarship
5.	English	Credential Problems
6.	English	Scholarship Problem
7.	Photography	Credential Problem
8.	Speech & Drama	Credential Problem
9.	Business Education	Housewife
10.	Physical Education	Professional Football
11.	Industrial Arts	Continuing Education
12.	Physical Education & Art	Continuing Education Applied for Teacher Corps
13.	Psychology & Chemistry	Dropped from program

Individualized Follow-Up:

The college co-director of Project TEACH attempted to play an encouraging or supporting role in relationships with the original enrollees during the year and a half following the conclusion of the on-site Education 411 class. Relationships with those whose directed teaching she supervised became very close; contact was kept with the others through correspondence, informal conferences and chance meetings on the college campus. When possible all of the original participants were invited to special functions dealing with the teaching of disadvantaged youth. One very satisfactory example of this was the inclusion of Project TEACH people in an all-day conference held as a follow-up to an N.D.E.A. Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth in December 1965.

Students were encouraged to discuss their scholarship or teacher credential problems with the co-director or with the other members of Project TEACH Staff. Some answers to their special problems were found; in others, just the opportunity to bring the problem to the attention of an understanding adult strengthened the students determination to continue toward a career in education.

During the school year 1965-66 the co-director visited the schools in which participants were teaching, frequently joined them at nutrition or lunch, and conferred with the school principals concerned. The relationships of the co-director to the first year teachers and their administrators was one of a friendly, professional co-worker and not that of school supervisor. At sometime during the school year 1965-66, those engaged in their first paid teaching assignments were guests in the home of the co-director on one or more occasions. Dr. Dale Knapp who conducted the interviews, and Dr. Carol Smallenburg who directs the on-site teacher preparation at Jefferson High School were present on a number of such occasions. Thus, was developed an atmosphere that helps make possible honest appraisal of college staff efforts to prepare teachers for inner city schools.

The on-the-job problems mentioned most frequently by the Project TEACH "graduates" are those common to most first year teachers. The young teacher is over-whelmed by the paper work. Just reading the bulletins from the various administrative offices is considered a staggering task. The beginning teacher is not quite certain where to turn for supportive assistance. It is noted that in schools where good human relationships exist that the young teachers are enthusiastic about teaching and especially about working in a disadvantaged area school. The co-director of this project is convinced that the leadership and human-relations training of secondary administrators and sub-administrators must receive attention at the same time that we give teachers special preparation for working with students in disadvantaged area schools.

CHAPTER 6 - PROSPECT AND RETROSPECT

Reviewing the Objectives

What has been learned in Project TEACH? To what extent were the objectives listed in chapter 1 accomplished? What is the relevance of the experiences gained in Project TEACH for the regular CSCLA teacher-education program? What assumptions in the existing program in general and in special methods and directed teaching need to be questioned? What changes, if any, are suggested? The following discussion is an attempt to arrive at a partial answer; for ease of discussion, the objectives are combined and re-worded as questions.

In what respects were professors of secondary education assisted in implementing changes in teacher-education curricula and in increasing their understanding of the "culture of poverty?" There are several ways to answer the question. The most obviously relevant response is the increase in on-site Education courses. Prior to the pilot program for Project TEACH, all or nearly all of the general methods courses were taught on the college campus. At the present time, three sections of the general-method courses are taught in the public schools with the real possibility of additional on-site courses being offered in subsequent semesters. In addition to the stimulation and encouragement provided by staff in Project TEACH, the highly creditable efforts of Professors Robert O. Hahn, Gertrude Robinson, and Carol Smallenburg are worthy of note. These staff members, due to a high sense of commitment and personal interest, have assumed the initiative in carving out opportunities in other districts and in teaching their own courses on public-school sites. It is also significant that the enrollment in on-site courses has increased indicating a growing popularity with the on-site concept among the student body.

There is also an increase in the number of staff members being sought as consultants, speakers, and resource personnel. Special materials including publications, tapes, and films are also more conspicuous throughout the teacher-education program. Perhaps one of the more encouraging types of recognition received as the result of experiences in Project TEACH was an invitation by the U.S. Office of Education to participate in the newly launched National Teacher Corp. The unprecedented participation by faculty members from such academic disciplines as psychology, sociology, and anthropology has also been an enriching influence upon teacher-education offerings.

How have the services of the college to public schools been improved? What evidence is there of support for teachers presently working in poverty area-secondary schools? One of the most effective responses to public-school needs has been the introduction of special workshops, institutes, and increased person to person contacts. Mid-way in Project TEACH a special NDEA institute for teachers of the disadvantaged was organized by the co-director of Project TEACH. Participants were drawn from the elementary and secondary schools located in the south-central part of Los Angeles sometimes referred to as the "curfew or riot" area. Staff members for this Institute included instructors from the Elementary and Secondary Education Departments, resource faculty from the Department of Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology, and three outstanding elementary and secondary-school teachers from the Los Angeles City Schools. Thus, the teaching staff can correctly be described as inter-departmental, inter-disciplinary, inter-school, and inter-racial.

A subsequent proposal for an institute for the preparation of supervising teachers has been made and, if accepted, will be initiated during the summer of 1967. The introduction to that proposal reads as follows:

> The Department of Secondary Education at California State College at Los Angeles proposes to initiate a six-week summer 1967 institute for fifty teachers currently teaching in secondary schools that cooperate with the College in the preparation of teachers in environmentally disadvantaged areas. From this group of fifty carefully selected teachers we aim to develop a core of teachers capable of assisting effectively with both the pre-service and the in-service preparation of teachers in environmentally disadvantaged schools of Los Angeles City. (author: Elsa May Smith)

It is also significant that high-school teachers voluntarily participated in in-service workshops especially designed for teachers of the disadvantaged. The financial support of the In-Service Division of Los Angeles City Schools is evidence of the felt need for such experiences. Excerpts from a letter written by the Principal of the pilot school, Thomas Jefferson High School, to the Deputy Superintendent are also of relevance.

> Two years ago we engaged in an experimental training program with California State College at Los Angeles whereby their participating observer and practice teacher programs were given a great deal of emphasis. The college assigned Mrs. Elsa May Smith and Dr. Carol Smallenburg to work directly with me in the program. As a result of the experimental program with the college, Jefferson High School has recruited competent teachers and has benefited greatly. The college is continuing to recruit for us and has obtained a rather large number of candidates to work in the program. . .
>
> Because of the interest in our school and in the program, there is greater demand for training teachers in our school. In order to accommodate the increased number of student teachers in particular subject fields and because Jefferson High School has some outstanding and competent non-permanent teachers

> with teaching experience, we would like to use them as training teachers. Several of these non-permanent teachers with previous experience were trained by us through the California State College program. (Quoted from a letter, dated January 24, 1966, from Mr. Donald Skinner, Principal of Jefferson High School to Dr. Louise W. Seyler, Deputy Superintendent of Los Angeles City Schools.)

Additional evidence of the close working relationships with the schools and of the college's interest in working with classroom teachers, is the recruitment of team-leaders from Los Angeles City School faculties for participation in the National Teacher Corps. Such teachers have been carefully screened and have had experience as highly successful teachers of the disadvantaged. Some of them were previously involved in the Project TEACH program.

The report of the follow-up of Project TEACH candidates given in Chapter 5 shows clearly that such teachers are seeking assignments in inner-city schools. More difficult to document but of considerable relevance is the continuing dialogue between Project TEACH staff and other staff members and the administrators and teachers of the inner-city schools. Follow-up interviews with teachers and administrators have yielded valuable clues to college staff for modification in course offerings, initiation of special in-service efforts, and the more effective utilization of public-school staffs in the preparation of beginning teachers.

Have prospective secondary-school teachers increased their understandings of the culture of poverty? Are Project TEACH candidates becoming effective faculty members in their initial experiences as full-time teachers? The solicited testimony of teachers and administrators who are working with these new teachers strongly indicates an unqualified "yes" to this question. In nearly every case, Project TEACH candidates have made highly satisfactory adjustments as beginning teachers. Follow-up conferences, and individual interviews have shown too that there is a high level of morale among the candidates. One need only refer back to the discussion of the taped interviews in chapter 3 to catch the strong feeling tone, the obvious dedication and idealism of these new teachers.

Since becoming employed, for example, two have been prepared by an experienced Los Angeles teacher to become reading specialists. Both candidates currently conduct successful classes in reading and have been drawn upon frequently as in-service leaders. They have also been observed frequently from out-of-town visitors seeking to learn more about methods of teaching the disadvantaged. Still another candidate worked successfully as a teacher in the Job Corps for Women and then re-entered one of the target schools where she had been a student teacher during Project TEACH. There are numerous other examples. There is the informal feedback to the project co-directer who keeps in close contact with her former charges. There is the request from school principals for similar efforts. There is the easily observable sense of identification which the participants have as former members of a special project. And, more important, there is a discernible pride in feeling reasonably capable in coping with the problems associated with teaching in disadvantaged neighborhoods.

The advantages of the Jefferson Project as identified by the college-student participants held generally true throughout Project TEACH. As listed in the AACTE report included in Appendix E, advantages of this project as perceived by students were:

1. the opportunity to work directly with high-school students
2. the opportunity to learn "how" by close observation and actual experience
3. the reduced over-lap in the subject matter of two required education courses
4. the increased understanding and appreciation of the teacher's job in an economically disadvantaged area
5. the inspiration received from dedicated faculty and administrators
6. the opportunity to move easily from the role of a student to that of a teacher
7. the opportunity provided to secure experience in the teacher's daily routines
8. the close relationship between college instructors and school personnel and the resulting advice and counsel received
9. the opportunity provided for interpretation of the operation of a comprehensive secondary school
10. the dispelling of fears concerning discipline and undesirable student behavior
11. the opportunity to view the total school program in relation to pupil and community needs

What changes in the regular teacher-education program are suggested as the result of experiences in Project TEACH? The major change suggested by Project Teach is an increased emphasis upon the application of skills and understandings. For example, the regular program does provide the prospective teacher with a variety of alternative teaching procedures, but affords only limited opportunity to apply them as part of an integrated instructional system in a realistic setting. Clearly, the simple change in location of courses from the college campus to the public schools afforded instructors an opportunity to relate theory much more closely to practice. Teaching candidates received first-hand exposure to the problems of disadvantaged youth. They were also made cognizant of the resources within a given school and community setting for dealing with such problems. The presence of a well qualified college instructor provided a safeguard against the over-generalization of specifics and the degeneration of the necessary theoretical framework into a series of ad hoc techniques.

Project TEACH also represented a successful demonstration of cooperative planning of the teacher-education experience between the teacher-education institution and the training school. Certainly, there is ample evidence to indicate the need for such a partnership. Thus, Project TEACH can with validity be perceived as a necessary forerunner of what school-college relationships should and could be. And, in the CSCLA program, the collective effort of college and school district is coming to be a reality for the total program. Since the inception of Project TEACH, arrangements for on-site courses have been made with two school districts in addition to Los Angeles City. It seems clear from the increasing number of special institutes, workshops, cooperative in-service efforts, and on-site courses that cooperative school-college planning has become the order of the day.

Project TEACH also has much to suggest to conventional teacher-education programs in its successful effort to reach out and involve constructively the "allied disciplines" represented on the academic departments. The contribution made by scholars in the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, and psychology greatly strengthened the program. There seems to be little reason why such efforts should not continue, or, in fact, why multi-disciplinary approaches to problems in teacher education should not be characteristic of all programs.

Questioning Assumptions of the Conventional Program

Project TEACH also identified or re-enforced concerns which should underlie future efforts at program modification. Following is a partial list of the kinds of concerns which should influence program change.

1. The assumption in the conventional program that three periods per week on three consecutive days is sufficient either in quantity or in sequence for the participation-observation requirement needs to be questioned.
2. The college staff needs to question the wisdom of offering all methods courses on the campus. (Is there an optimum combination of time to be spent in both settings during the same course?)
3. The staff needs to know much more about the attitudes of teachers on the staffs of the receiving public schools. A faculty with low morale can demoralize a teaching candidate and destroy the sense of adventure and dedication so common in the novice. "Don't come here--this is a graveyard!" Such attitudes on the part of some master teachers must be frankly recognized and even anticipated, and should be part of the candidate's formal orientation.
4. The practice of terminating all contact by the college with the cadet once the formal program is over must also be questioned. The experiences in the demonstration project show that follow-up visits by college staff members during the first one or two

years of employment can be invaluable both to the candidate and to the college staff.

5. The demonstration project reaffirms the necessity of keeping the program on a voluntary basis. Teacher education candidates who find the work with disadvantaged youth something less than they anticipated should be permitted easy exit. Similarly, college staffs should avoid any rigid commitments and retain the right to withdraw a candidate or an entire program if need be.

6. Selection procedures should be continuous throughout the program rather than limited to formal decision points such as entrance into teacher education curriculum and entrance into student teaching.

7. The college staff needs to explore the possibility of extending field experiences to the community and of establishing teaching clinics in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Such clinics would encompass a major portion of the professional curricula and provide assistance not only to teacher education candidates but to experienced teachers as well.

8. The staff needs to question the provision in the conventional program for acquainting the candidate with instructional materials in use in the school. A planned program, possibly in district offices or in individual public schools, would seem to offer much more promise.

9. The staff needs to give much more attention to the organization of instruction and selection of subject-matter topics in the general and special methods courses. Conceivably, topics previously treated in Ed 411 (general methods) might be de-emphasized or deleted from the Ed 493 special methods courses thus affording Ed 493 instructors more time for discussion peculiarly related to the teaching specialization.

10. Consideration should be given to re-designing field experiences according to a different concept of structure. It is conceivable that all candidates should have certain field experiences in common, such as instruction in diagnosing and correcting reading problems, in role-playing various problems and human relationships, in viewing together selected master teachers, in identification and uses of special services, etc. Other experiences such as the continuous participation-observation and student teaching need to be tailor-made for the unique talents and problems of the individual.

Summary

In summary, then, what has emerged as the result of Project TEACH is a more promising approach towards helping prospective teachers understand and cope with the problems of teaching in disadvantaged areas. Through working more closely with public schools, their faculties and their students; through person-to-person contact of both college instructors and teaching aspirants with the front-line workers in the schools; through a special emphasis upon application of skills rather than acquisition of subject matter, much more has been learned about the real needs of the disadvantaged than would have been learned vicariously from text assignments and lectures alone.

Admittedly, the Project has raised more questions than it has offered solutions. And, like most such efforts, few if any guarantees or pat formulas have resulted. However, it is significant that participants have developed a highly visible esprit de corps, that they have become committed to providing quality education for the disadvantaged, where before there appeared to be little conspicuous interest. The changes evident in the candidates can not be displayed on graphs or charts with frequent mention of "statistically significant changes." What can be shown is that professors are more willing to venture off compus to take on the inconvenience but the high promise of on-site courses, that original recruitment efforts to attract teacher-education candidates have been replaced with efforts of selection and orientation. There are more volunteers for special work with the disadvantaged than previously when Project TEACH was in its infancy.

And special programs to assist supervising teachers are being planned. Staff members from the School of Education and the allied disciplines are following through with a myriad of special projects to help this or that need made visible through Project TEACH. There is encouragement, too, in the increasing number of college staff members who have been requested to participate in school sponsored workshops, conferences, and the like. Curriculum materials and subject emphasis, particularly at the college level are being re-examined. There is hope that innovations made possible through Project TEACH will have increasing effect in the teacher-education programs for all candidates. Certainly, the instructors whose participation in the Project was most immediate and direct have acquired something of value of which future classes will be the beneficiaries.

APPENDIX

A. Curriculum Guides
  1. **Education 411: Curriculum Procedures Materials, and Evaluation in Secondary Schools**

  2. **Education 493: Methods and Materials in Secondary School Subjects**

  3. **Supplementary Field Experiences**

B. Cooperating Teacher Reaction Sheet

C. On-site Education 411
  1. **Outline Quide for Establishing an On-site Course**

  2. **Sample Communications Bulletins**

  3. **Supplementary Reports**

D. Questionnaire Responses

E. Reports to American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

APPENDIX A1

Education 411

See "black book" for copy of course outline.

Appendix A2

Education 493 - Methods and Materials in Secondary School Subjects

Course Outline (Tentative) - 1964-65

I. Prerequisite or corequisite: Education 400, 410, and 411. A series of professional courses intended for prospective secondary school teachers in indicated subject fields. Each course will include consideration of objectives, methods, materials, and problems involved in teaching the particular field. Each candidate for a secondary credential must complete the appropriate methods course in his major or minor. The methods course should be taken prior to Education 542 or 543.

493 A	Methods of Teaching Art
493 Bb	Methods of Teaching Bookkeeping
493 Bg	Methods of Teaching General Business Subjects
493 Bs	Methods of Teaching Shorthand (1)
493 Bt	Methods of Teaching Typewriting
493 E	Methods of Teaching English
493 FL	Methods of Teaching Foreign Language
493 HE	Methods of Teaching Home Economics
493 H&S	Methods of Teaching Health and Safety Education
493 IA	Methods of Teaching Industrial Arts
493 Ma	Methods of Teaching Mathematics
493 MuA	Methods of Teaching Instrumental Music
493 MuB	Methods of Teaching Choral Music
493 MuC	Methods of Teaching Elementary Music
493 N	Methods of Teaching Nursing
493 PE	Methods of Teaching Physical Education
493 SA	Methods of Teaching Speech Arts
493 Sc	Methods of Teaching Science
493 SS	Methods of Teaching Social Studies

II. General Objectives for Education 493: The objective of Education 493 is to form a synthesis of all previous course work both in education and in the specialty area and to sharply focus this knowledge on the techniques and materials appropriate to effective teaching in the designated area. To implement this major objective the following will be sought as goals of Education 493:

1. To develop in the prospective teacher sensitivity to student needs in the specialty area and methods of dealing with these needs within the framework of the secondary school curriculum.

2. To develop in the prospective teacher awareness and appreciation of individual differences among students in their specialty area and to vary both specific

techniques and content to deal effectively with these differences.

3. To develop in the prospective teacher a sharper focus on himself as a person and on his role in his area of professional competence, in the school and in the larger community.

4. To develop in the prospective teacher an appreciation of the vast range of possibilities in educational techniques and materials in this specialty.

5. To develop in the prospective teacher the concern for continuous reappraisal of learning theories, teaching techniques and content so that this concern may in turn develop into a vital program throughout the teaching career.

Specific Topics

A. Content Specialty
   - History of particular subject in the secondary school - major trends
   - Current developments and issues

B. Classroom management specific to subject specialty
   - Legal responsibilities
   - Record keeping
   - Grading and reporting
   - Classroom routines
   - Discipline
   - Cheating
   - Standards

C. Teaching principles specific to subject specialty
   - Techniques of presentation
   - Delivery
   - Planning - long range and short range
   - Individual differences
     - educationally disadvantaged
     - slow learner
     - gifted
     - atypical
   - Teacher-made tests

D. Teaching materials specific to subject specialty
   - Projects
   - Bulletin boards
   - Audio visual materials - models, filmstrips, movies, mockups
   - Field trips
   - Sources of materials
   - Library materials
   - Laboratory materials

E. Professional responsibilities
   - Maintaining sensitivity to students, their needs and differences
   - Keeping up-to-date in content and methodology (journals, in-service training, reading, etc.)

Developing the habit of creativity and imagination in using techniques to improve instruction with consistency

F. Professional behavior
  - Appearance and general behavior
  - Evaluation of performance as student teacher and probationary teacher
  - Relationships with colleagues and supervisors
  - Relationships with students
  - Relationships with parents
  - Conformity -- when? how much?

III. A student who has completed Education 493 should be able to show depth of understanding of the following questions.

1. What are the relationships of the given subject field experience to the total educational program of the students? What are the unique contributions of the given subject field to the total educational program of student?
2. Based on the awareness that students learn in various ways, name several methods of teaching which are effective to different modes of learning.
3. How may a teacher select and organize his subject field content so as to provide for adequate learning by students?
4. What are the principles and procedures for establishing student experiences to supplement, vary, or supplant the lecture, technique of presentation?
5. What special resources and materials are available to teachers for classroom use in this given subject field?
6. What are the professional sources of material for teachers in this given subject field? Include the names of two journals or magazines, a description of the aims and something of the specific content of each.
7. Indicate the history and development of the given subject field in the secondary school curriculum.
8. What are the current issues involved in the given subject field and the significant influences, organizations, and leadership which are prominent?
9. What are the criteria for establishing a total and effective program of evaluation in the given subject field?
10. What are the special techniques in using and interpreting standardized tests in the given subject field? What are the special techniques in constructing, grading and interpreting teacher-made tests in the given subject field?
11. What is the professional responsibility of the teacher in the given subject field to the total educational program and to the educational community?
12. What personal qualities, appearances, and habits should the teacher develop to become an effective teacher in the given subject field?

IV. Bibliography. A selective bibliography shall be provided by each of the given subject fields.

V. Teaching aids. A selective list of films and other teaching aids shall be provided by each of the given subject fields.

Appendix A3

SUPPLEMENTAL FIELD EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT

The supplemental field experience requirement, as the name denotes, is intended to make more complete the student teacher's understanding of the secondary school. Since the student is generally required to teach for only one or two periods in a school day, it is necessary that he receive additional opportunities to observe and to participate in the total life of the school.

From time to time questions arise as to the number and correct disposition of hours required for supplemental field experiences. These questions can be categorized under the quantitative and the qualitative.

Quantitative:

At the present time 50 hours is required for each of the two assignments. If a student signs for a double assignment, he will be expected to put 100 additional hours into Supplementary Field Experiences. These hours are to be computed exclusive of seminar.

Qualitative:

The question: "How should these hours be used" cannot be answered in so precise a fashion. Generally, it is expected that the hours will be spent in activities which are not directly related to the student's teaching responsibilities. In other words, the time spent preparing lessons, grading tests, or conferring with the training teacher cannot properly be considered as part of this requirement. The exact responsibilities are usually arrived at through some joint agreement between the college supervisor, the student teacher, and the supervising teacher. Typical ways in which students have used these hours to secure a broader perspective of the educator's role are:

1. Assistance at school dances, parties, projects, parent nights, P.T.A., college nights, etc.
2. Extended observation in other classes to secure new insights.
3. Assistance in the administrative offices, the guidance office, in extra-curricular activities, or athletic events.
4. Intensive study of one or more students.*

Evidence for hours spent is usually secured through some self-reporting device in which the student keeps his own record including the date, nature of the responsibility, time spent, and the educational significance for him. Some college supervisors may wish to require the student to secure the last name or the initials of the school staff member for whom or under whom the work is undertaken. This statement

of significance need not be included for each separate responsibility but rather as a result of all of the activities during the semester. Total number of hours should then be entered in the college supervisor's grace book and together with the written report is kept by him as a part of each student's records.

***Students in the department of Industrial Arts use the majority of this time by spending an additional period in the school each day. See Information Series I.**

APPENDIX B

COOPERATING TEACHER REACTION SHEET

Name of Classroom Teacher ____________________ ________________
Subject or Activity (Grade)

Name of Participating Observer ____________________

The student observer participated frequently ______, occasionally ______, did not participate ________.

Nature of Participation:

________Worked with individual students	________Made bulletin board display
________Gave demonstrations	________Used other audio-visual aids
________Assisted with routine duties	________Worked with small groups
________Constructed or graded exams	
________Checked written work	
________Gave short oral presentations	

Other ____

____

Please Check One:	Very Satisfactory	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory	No opportunity to observe
The observer's proficiency when participating was. . .	______	______	______	______
The observer's relation-ships with students were .	______	______	______	______
The observer's attitude toward performing sug-gested tasks was	______	______	______	______
The observer's appearance was	______	______	______	______
The observer's attendance was	______	______	______	______

COMMENTS (e.g. discussion of characteristic(s) marked above, personal qualities noted, potential as a teacher, etc.)

APPENDIX C

OUTLINE GUIDE FOR ESTABLISHING AN "ON-SITE" COURSE

Carol J. Smallenburg, Associate Professor of Secondary Education

How does one go about developing on-site courses so that the advantages to the secondary school staff and to the prospective teacher will be realized? What types of pre-planning have proven successful? What are the specifics of admission, recruitment, scheduling, and evaluating? The following outline is intended to provide some of the answers as well as to provide one useful frame of reference for teacher-educators and school personnel contemplating the introduction of on-site courses.

I. Pre-planning

A. Assessing resources in on-site school and community

1. Preview of the on-site school for learning experiences in curriculum, materials, evaluation
    a. Student services opportunities, i.e., pupil personnel offices, etc. Homerooms.
    b. Student activities opportunities, such as student government, special interest clubs, etc.
    c. Classroom interaction situations in: various subject content areas: Academic, electives etc., some particular phase of work: i.e., demonstrations, discussion, organization, etc.
2. Review of leadership abilities of faculty for working with a young adult in a "training" situation.
3. Location of facilities for accommodating teacher-education students and college coordinator.
4. Assessing opportunities for community interaction.

B. Preparing for the mechanics of registering and recruiting a group from the college.

1. Publicizing arrangements in college schedule.
2. Arranging for instructional materials; equipment to augment facilities at the on-site school.
3. Recruiting for college or other specialists to serve as instructional consultants to the on-site group as needs arise. Possible needs: reading, school-community relations.

C. Providing for on-going communication

1. Between on-site program, its students and coordinator, and
    a. the college "back-home"
    b. the faculty and other personnel of the on-site school
    c. the school's community

2. Among on-site students, the college coordinator, school administrators, faculty of the on-site school.

II. Initiating the teacher-education students into an on-site experience

A. General orientation for the teacher-education students:

1. Organized class sessions, nature of school, community; history of school, community; introduction to major school personnel, locations; general organization of activities, curriculum, etc.
2. Tours of school and community under guidance of senior students; community leaders, school-community coordinators involved.
3. General information about the school program, schedules, routines, emergency information, etc.
4. Some introduction to the pupils, their kinds of problems, backgrounds, goals, etc.

B. Preliminary assessment of the teacher-education student

1. Exploration of interests which apply to the secondary school program: subjects, activities, special skills, travel, work-experiences, etc.
2. A self-testing and self-assessment program in terms of basic skills and competencies needed for teaching.
3. Screening program for regular teacher education.
4. Survey of hours--scheduling problems as well as problems inherent in the high school master schedule in order to make specific assignments for the teacher-education students.

C. Specific scheduling of on-site participation experiences for teacher-education students.

1. Establish about three or four sub-groups around the interests of the students and the offerings of the school situation. For example: classroom experiences
   student services experiences
   school-community experiences
2. Students will rotate from one sub-group assignment to another during the semester in order to receive varied and balanced experiences.
3. The nature of the sub-groups and the experiences they are having will furnish guidelines for the on-going seminar-class associated with the Education 411 participation experience.

D. Assuring a quality learning experience

1. Orientation of both teacher-education students and faculty members as to objectives of the program will be very important.
2. Continuous feed-back from both teacher-education students

and faculty members or school-community coordinator will be important, for the college coordinator will use these data as clues for the seminar-class instructional program.

3. The seminar-class will be divided into sub-groups in order to maximize the possibilities of interaction between theory and direct experience for the individual candidate.
4. When the nature of the direct experiences provided by the on-site situation does not permit a variety of learnings, new ideas, new instructional aids, resources, equipment, or whatever may be deemed needed will be introduced.
5. The alternative to securing broad experiences, if the direct experiences are limiting, will be re-assignment for the teacher-education student into some new area, classroom, locale, etc.
6. Relevant resource literature in education and sociology will be available and assigned as it becomes pertinent. The development of an on-site teacher-education library is a must.

III. Evaluating a program of on-site teacher education

A. Value derived by the teacher-education student

1. Sources of evidence: self-analysis
   Activity logs, self-report of values, products developed for instructional experiences in classrooms, activities, services, study of a secondary-school pupil, check-lists, etc.
2. Sources of evidence: sub-group
   Discussions, role-playing, peer-evaluation, reactions to various learning situations, ratings, etc.
3. Sources of evidence: seminar-class interactions written and oral problem analysis, discussions, interaction with group
4. Sources of evidence: college-coordinator-student conferences
5. Expressions of satisfactions from the on-site students about their experiences. (especially during panel discussion to college classes.)

B. Value derived by having such a program for the on-site school

1. Analysis of activity-logs to see that assignments done by school's students have significance and value for the "make-work" or irrelevant, "time-consuming" projects of minimal value to the school.

   Some examples of on-going school activities used to benefit both school and the teacher-education program have been:
   - Study of a student with a special problem
   - Organization and participation in leadership training
   - Tutoring, small-group coaching for students with problems

Tour of college campus with the honor group of the school and later a similar and larger tour of the "college-potential" group.

Enrichment of curriculum through special experiences the teacher-education students bring: Peace Corps, work experiences, outside resource speakers, tours for small groups, information and materials from foreign countries, etc.

Studies of enrichment materials for instructional purposes which library has on hand but not being used to capacity.

2. Evidences of sound morale on part of participating faculty, administrators, community workers, pupils about the teacher-education program. Questionnaires, interviews, etc.

C. Value to the college's teacher-education program

   1. On-site teacher education student's comments, communication to "back-home" instructors, peer-students
      Example: panel discussions of on-site students in the college classes.
   2. Recruitment of new group of on-site students from contacts made by the current or past members of the program.
   3. Interest of on-site students in teaching in a similar school for their student teaching or regular teaching assignment.
   4. Evidence of contributions of insight and experiences to other college classes where on-site teacher-education students are.

D. Follow-up results of on-site students as they move out into regular teaching.

   1. Their evidence of success in their regular job--especially during the first transition period to the regular load.
   2. Their feelings of satisfaction or evidences of "need to improve" about the on-site program as they see it several years later.

E. Reactions of regular on-site teachers to the experiences they see the teacher-education students having. Their expression of "if I had been able to do something like that . ."

F. Expressions of satisfaction of school's administrators about contributions of the teacher-education students to their programs.

G. Expressions of satisfaction of school's teachers about the contributions of the teacher-education students to their work..

H. Expression of satisfaction of pupils in the school to the work the teacher-education students may have been able to contribute to them.

APPENDIX C1

SAMPLE COMMUNICATION BULLETIN

1. **Parent-Teacher Membership Drive.**

   If you are not already a member of a Parent-Teacher Association, you may wish to join at either Markham or Jordan.

2. **Noon Conferences**

   Dining Room B at CSCLA has been reserved for our group from 12:00 - 1:00 on Wednesdays, October 14, 21, 28. If you wish to buy or bring your lunch and join in the informal "social-discussion" hour please do so. This is an invitation and not a must.

3. Mr. Frank Toggenburger, Head Counselor at Markham Junior High will speak with us this morning about school records. It is important that you note carefully what he has to say and abide by any instructions he may give. Please feel free to ask Mr. Toggenburger any questions you may have concerning your relationships to school records.

4. **Supplementary Reading**

   Begin turning in supplementary reading reports. They may be placed in my mail box in the main office or given to me at the time of our Monday meetings.

5. **Resource Materials**

   For your convenience a limited number of books, magazines, courses of study, etc., have been placed in the book case in our classroom at Markham. You may arrange to check out any of this material. (Who will volunteer to serve as class librarian?) Please do not limit your professional supplementary reading to that so easily available! Also, from time to time bring to our attention books, magazines or newspaper articles related to the topics we may be studying.

6. **Participation-Observation Logs**

   Keep record of your participation-observations up to date. Organize your records and any materials you may be given. Please let me see how you are progressing with this part of your work. You may drop in to see me during my office hours or make an appointment for a conference.

7. **Professional Advisement**

   Please feel free to come to me with any problems you may meet in relationship to this class, your future student teacher assignment, or teacher credential requirements. If I do not know the answers, I'll help you find someone who does.

APPENDIX C2

SAMPLE COMMUNICATION BULLETIN

1. Reminder: Informal luncheon-meeting 12 noon, Wednesday, October 28.

2. Student Teaching. If you anticipate difficulty in securing major or minor department approval, please see me before you make the formal application. If you have not had the complete physical, please do so soon. Thus, one more requirement will be out of the way.

3. Participation. You should be having some actual experiences in working with children as individuals or in small groups. If you are not able to participate in at least some of the teacher roles, please see me at once. Ideally, what you do in the school should be worthwhile both to the school and to you. Let us make it so.

4. Reading. Continue to read in the general areas that will give you some insight into the social scene. Concentrate your reading on materials related to the curriculum. Look for answers to such questions as:

   What is taught? Why is it in the curriculum? Who decides on curriculum content? How does curriculum change come about?

5. Special Report. Los Angeles City Teacher Institute of October 24. James Bledsoe and Sandra Swearington.

6. Recommended for voluntary attendance. Los Angeles City Schools Conference on Programs of Urban Education, November 14, Los Angeles Trade Technical College. Further information is on bulletin board.

7. Evaluation of work in Education 411

   The items listed here will be considered in determining final grades.

   Reports from teachers (Markham and Jordan)
   Observation Reports (logs)
   Lesson Plans (2)
   Reading Reports (Quantity and quality)
   Attendance at seminar. Also attendance and participation beyond or below that assigned
   Final examination
   Completion of a questionnaire. (This will not be opened until after grades are filed.)

   The article by Miriam Goldberg, "Adapting Teacher Style to Pupil Differences--Teachers for Disadvantaged Children," should be read thoughtfully and kept in a notebook or file for future reference.

APPENDIX C3

1. Plan time to read, view, or listen to material that you believe may be useful, thought-provoking, interesting, and reasonably pertinent to the course you are taking or to the community in which you are doing your participation-observation.

2. Reading lists and reading materials will be brought to your attention by the instructor. Some materials will be available to you in the Education 471 classroom. Please share with the class additional reading or viewing material that you have found pertinent to teacher preparation.

3. Written reading and viewing reports should be made throughout the semester. Reports may be turned in at any time. Please keep them very simple.
   (a) Use 4" x 6" file cards for each item on which you report.
   (b) Identify each item with full bibliographical data.
   (c) Put your name in the upper right hand corner of the card.
   (d) Write not more than three sentences citing the key idea or ideas. (What is it about?)
   (e) Write not more than three sentences indicating your appraisal of the material. (Why does or does it not matter?)

4. SAMPLE

NAME

Full bibliographical data

1. Reading Content. (Not more than three sentences indicating What It Is About)

2. Your Appraisal. (Not more than three sentences indicating The Significance of It.)

APPENDIX D

Selected Questions From QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT TEACH

Questions 32, 34, 35 and 36 as answered by Project Teach participants at conclusion of Education 411 class. (February 1, 1965)

(32) Do you think your attitudes toward children have been changed or modified as a result of your experiences in Project TEACH? ______ Please explain: ______________________________________

1. Yes. I am more willing to believe now that children are products of their environment. I am also more willing to take them on their own ground. I am more patient when my neighbors don't understand, and more eager to see each child as an individual and not just as a "kid."

2. Yes. I've found that the people in this culturally deprived area are very normal in many ways.

3. No. At least not toward children in an area such as the target area.

4. Yes. Experience in Project TEACH is wonderful because it gives you a view of the other side of a situation. I have gone to school all my life with students of the middle class range, therefore, I saw only one side and heard about the other side. Now through my experiences in Project TEACH I have gained greater insight into the lives of children in a lower socio-economic status.

5. Yes. There are many things that a teacher would like to do that he can not. Before entering project TEACH, I thought that all classes and all individuals in these classes would learn more from a teacher who was brilliant than one who was not. This does not follow.

6. Yes. After talking to some of the parents and seeing the living conditions under which some of these children are brought up I can see why these children have so much trouble adjusting to the society norms. This environment is also a great hindrance in the educational patterns or attitudes of these children.

7. Yes. I believe I now have a clearer picture of some of the conditions and their effects that take place in the schools. I probably have a more tolerant attitude toward the student of poor development--but not toward the cause of his poor development.

8. Yes. I believe knowing other people is a good thing. The more we know them the more we can understand them and see the way they feel and reasons for their actions. I think Project TEACH is a good approach to the problem you are trying to solve.

9. No.

10. No. Since I was raised in a racially mixed area my attitudes are still the same, though, this experience has deepened my understanding of many of the problems and given me more knowledge about them.

11. No. I have had enough previous contact with people and children in such an environment to have established, fairly well, my attitudes toward them.

12. No and yes. I have always admired a child who honestly wanted to learn and I had nothing to do with those who didn't. I found I had the same attitude with these children. I was very fond of those students who showed an interest in their work and I constantly preached to those who didn't show any interest at all.

13. No. I still think that every student can be motivated to learn.

14. No. I had no preconceived ideas about the students. I went in as an observer and a learner.

15. No. I still hold my basic concept that in every child there is an individual wanting, longing, asking to be recognized.

16. No. Although I am familiar with this situation, I didn't realize the seriousness and the real misfortune of these students.

17. No. My attitude has been reinforced--through TEACH, and my work.

18. Certainly. I feel that I'm much more sure of myself in some areas and less sure of myself in others. It does these children good just to have people around them that mean them well. I didn't know how many strikes some children are born with.

19. No. I have always liked and respected children. To them, especially am I color-blind. Their outlook is one of curiosity and freshness and originality--three traits too easily lost in the process of growing up--no matter what color the adult.

20. Yes. I've gained a deeper understanding of their problems in general. This altered my belief somewhat that many of them were "troublemakers."

21. Yes. I had never particularly cared for boy students. I had hoped that my children would all be girls. The boys seem to be the most interested, capable and dynamic students generally. These are the Negro leaders of tomorrow and they should be aided at every opportunity. The secondary school covers the problem years for girls so their need must not be over-looked. I overheard several of the administrators say that the problems of the girls were not solved as easily as those of the boys.

22. I have always liked the young. I wish however that (and this without seeming prudish) that I could find a code of morality among the

older boys and girls in Jordan which could stand up to middle class standards. It is my belief, however, that when the War on Poverty really makes itself felt that better living conditions and educational climate will do much to bring about a more desirable attitude towards authority and decency.

23. No. I have always identified closely with children--especially at the Jr. High age. The project TEACH children have perhaps an extra appeal because I can foresee as they cannot how heavily the deck is stacked against their chances for productive happy lives.

(34) What suggestions would you give to teacher educators in the colleges and universities and to school administrators in preparing and placing new teachers for work with the culturally deprived?

---

1. I feel very strongly that a program such as this one is needed. Teachers need to see and work in and feel for the area in which they work. It can't just be an eight to three job. There need to be psychology courses, methods courses and courses in all other areas of study prepared and present in light of the situations in these areas.

2. Keep it on a choice level. Many teachers working in this area are there because it was the only job available. Encourage students to gain information about the area and they will go into the area with the attitude that they're going because they want to go.

3. Education courses used to prepare new teachers should stress the problems of the culturally deprived and techniques that would be useful in such an area instead of presenting material that prepares the new teacher for work in a situation that is far closer to the ideal. The teachers placed in such an area should be well aware of the problems they will face and be well informed about the area they will be working in, that is, the neighborhood.

4. Give them an opportunity to see and work with culturally deprived students. Also teach methods by which a teacher will be able to handle situations that may arise. Conduct class geared to such areas so the teacher will be able to prepare himself somewhat before entering these schools.

5. (None.)

6. Know your subject area very well. Be well organized. Be prepared to deal with many personality disorders and how to treat these individuals or guide them on the preferred path of education.

7. Make them aware that there are no real differences in the way children think. However, prepare them for a sometimes depressing job, as the teacher may many times witness a real waste of potential in some of the students.

8. More of the same--this is a good program but needs to be expanded, because a percentage will naturally move to other things. Exposing the students and getting them to feel the need is your best weapon.

9. (None.)

10. I believe there should be more specific course work in methods, sociology problems of the culturally deprived and psychology of the culturally deprived; active observation in higher economic areas for direct comparison between the cultural mean and the culturally deprived. I also feel that there should be work in all culturally deprived areas so the beginning teacher will be prepared not only for Negro areas but also for other groups.

11. In addition to already required subject matter, it is of importance that the potential teacher of the culturally deprived should be fortified with additional learning in discipline and motivation. I find that our present teachers neither know how to cope with the problem nor are motivated to do so, nor are colleges offering an opportunity for them to get this experience (until Project TEACH).

12. Great study in: a) motivation; b) combat laziness; c) indifference; c) discipline.

13. Have a guidance clinic where students from the culturally deprived areas can discuss their problems with future teachers. In this way we can better understand their problems.

14. Try to screen out early those who are opportunists and those teachers who have a fatalistic attitude of the students' "permanent lack of ability."

15. Just to prepare them to treat each student as an individual no different from the students with whom they attended school.

16. I think they should be screened, so that none will teach who do not understand the problems of these students. The most important thing for learning will probably depend upon the rapport established by the teacher, and this is definitely impossible if the teacher isn't cognizant of the students' problems.

17. Tell them the truth so they won't be disenchanted. Progress will seem almost imperceptible.

18. 1. Form two sets of standards. Maintain your own. 2. Then study the life they have until you can bend yours around

theirs. I find that most of my lower middle class standards need some changing.

19. **To be realistic in their approach and to be interested in the subject enough to inspire the students to work on their own.**

20. **Give them an opportunity to observe in the area of the culturally deprived in order to acquaint themselves with the problems of the culturally deprived. Train them in the area of how to teach culturally disadvantaged children.**

21. **In my education classes I repeatedly heard that a teacher must accept a student as he is--and work from that. The feeling of caring is one that I feel is essential. But how do you test for that? Special training in reading would be helpful.**

22. **It is important to locate concealed cameras which could, out of strategic locations tell a much truer tale than any one teacher can ever hope to see. The resulting video tapes or film could be edited and produced as a special film for school and general viewing. To arrive on a campus with a battery of cameras ostensibly is to create a film which has no special message. It has been my experience in this field that people are more real and meaningful to viewers if they are not aware of any recording equipment.**

23. **More preparation just like this course. I think there is a need for a more specific understanding of how children learn. What are the concepts they must have that we take for granted but that the culturally deprived lack? I think more basic research in the area is vital.**

(35) As you see it, what are the strong points of this program? (Project TEACH)

---

1. **The strongest point I see in the program is the close association with the areas in which one expects to teach. Project TEACH has given us a chance to test ourselves, a chance to grow in understanding, and a chance to decide whether or not we are qualified to teach with such children. Another strong point is the interest of those involved. This is no common class. I felt that all involved grew closer to understanding much of human nature and well as the problem we hope to have a hand in arresting.**

2. **Offers an opportunity to really get to know the hearts of people who are in the focus of contemporary news. Offers an opportunity to become dedicated to an interesting and worthwhile area of endeavor.**

3. **The program is valuable because it gives the new teacher an opportunity to work in an area and experience its problems in**

person instead of just reading about it or hearing about it in a lecture. Even if some of the students in the program do not eventually select this area to teach in, they have, because of the program,a greater awareness of the problems. At least this student hopes they do. Actual experience in this program has helped me gain a much better picture of this area than I had before from personal experience and heresay.

4. 1. Opportunity of working with children of culturally deprived areas. 2. Gaining a new viewpoint either pro or con about such areas. 3. Learning about the schools, teachers, staffs, etc. 4. Learning new problems or more acute problems than found in middle class schools.

5. This program offers great insight into the complete function of the schools program. Classroom, administration, counseling are the most important phases covered in this program. This program builds self-confidence so an individual could go into the school and do a good job without any fear of blundering the job. This is the most beneficial class I have had in college as far as practical teaching experience.

6. Putting the prospective teacher right in the teaching situation. Acquainting us with other school procedures such as the offices, etc.

7. The strongest point is exposure. Getting people acquainted there and haveing them feel needed.

8. 1. It is great preparation for student teaching. I feel prepared to do my student teaching now. 2. The way the class met and by seeing other class members daily (and not in the classroom atmosphere) I became very fond of most of the class members.

9. 1. Active class participation; 2. active participation in the other school departments; 3. the realistic approach of the program (not the crusading attitude that could have been presented); 4. money (a great incentive to learning and participation.)

10. Project TEACH has given the experience neither book nor college teacher could give in the so-called methods and foundations of education classes. In a short time, a person can acquire much experience and ability. The "Project" will give him insight and experience in both methods and technique, and in problems of the the actual teacher and a directive in the way he could better prepare himself to be a "qualified teacher."

11. I think this program taught me a hundred times more than sitting in a lecture class. In a class there are so many idealistic theories that attract you and you think will work but actual application of methods and techniques are more than anyone can ask for. It's really a great experience.

12. Participation and observation of actual classroom conditions.

13. The wonderful first-hand experience gained in the classroom. Being able to do close yet unconspicuous observation. Getting the feel of a classroom as a teacher rather than a student.

14. 1. The great amount of time in the field experience; 2. the increased interaction between the observers and the students; 3. the service feature; 4. the weekly discussion meetings.

15. Probably the amount of participation allowed by many teachers. By working closely with the students the observer's obtain much more insight into the problems and also develop techniques that are invaluable.

16. 1. The dedication--genuine interest to modify a gross problem in the community; 2. the real singular purpose of the participants and their eagerness to serve.

17. Contact with children and teaching experience.

18. Helps a student teacher to gain a little insight into these problems. May influence more teachers to get interested in trying to change the mores if not the environment through education.

19. The strong points of this program heavily outweigh the weak ones. I enjoyed the opportunity to work with the students much like the teachers did. I believe it is a good practice to acquaint students with the administrators and the faculty. The service hour was unique and rewarding.

20. The opportunity to actually go into the school under the supervision of a teacher who is enthusiastic--and not be penalized for your lack of understanding and out-and-out ignorance concerning so many of the things in a school that one has to experience before they can actually begin to understand it.

21. It gives the student (me) some time actually teaching. It removes much stage fright. It makes the student more self-reliant. He learns how a school is run in many of the offices--these things he learned in class too, but experience is a great teacher. It takes away much fear. Rumors circulate wildly in a class such as this, on the dangerous nature of the work. It takes little contact with these students to realize that many of them are simply poorer than students we knew formerly. Many are violent and are constantly in trouble with school and law alike. But the majority are deserving of every help.

22. Working in the actual classroom situation, with the understanding support of experienced teachers and the feeling there was a real committment to somehow solving the difficult problems involved.

(36) As you see it, what are the weak points of this program?

1. Time was probably the weakest point in the program. I always felt pushed. My class schedule was such that I had to hurry back to Cal State and never really had a chance to do the research I wanted to on the students with whom I was working. Another weak point, also related to time, was the lack of discussion among the group as to the problems we were facing, and our solutions to some of them.

2. There is a possibility of observing an inadequate teacher who is failing in this area. Such a teacher is liable to blame the area rather than himself and will probably pass such an attitude on to the observer.

3. I am going to beg this question. Since the program is not complete and can be best evaluated only after it is completed I do not feel capable of giving a sound answer to this question.

4. 1. More time should be allowed with the students. 2. Closer student-observer and class relationship should be attained with the help of the instructor.

5. I believe this program has no weak points as it is now functioning. This program is a great attribute to the Education department. I believe it is the most beneficial I have ever experienced. I believe that education should have many more classes patterned along the same lines as this class.

6. The only part of the program that I felt was weak was the seminar meetings. It seemed to me that Monday's were always used for getting business out of the way. What I missed was hearing about the experiences of the other potential teachers in this program.

7. "Time". The enormous amount of time required at the school, travel and preparation for class lectures was my biggest problem. I believe the instructor showed a great deal of understanding and foresight not to assign busy work and give tests during the semester.

8. 1. The work was only in a Negro area; 2. not enough seminar time; 3. required reading. The last two points were put down because I think that with more time and required readings about work with the culturally deprived the class would be able to come to a clearer understanding of the problems. (The class would have a common area to work out from.)

9. The weak points of the program are few. However, the program might be reinforced with more seminars with persons dealing directly with the field of "culturally deprived" or with those in a "low economic status," and I do believe there is a difference.

10. This is hard to say, but if you don't know what a "normal" school is like you have nothing with which to compare. Teaching in a culturally deprived area may leave the impression that all schools are like that. Maybe if there was some way in comparing to different types of schools, this may be useful.

11. We are only exposed to school conditions and not to cultural and home backgrounds.

12. I loved the program. As noted below in (37) I received great benefit from this class. In all seriousness though, I feel that the things I was able to observe will be of great benefit to me in student teaching.

13. Students wanting to enter the program should do so with more time to devote to the school.

14. I don't think enough units are allowed for the program. Admittedly this program is voluntary and for those who wish to gain insight into this area of teaching. Nevertheless, because of the experience one receives, I think one should receive more unit credit.

15. Not enough classroom time or time for conferences--teachers.

16. Its shortness. Lack of opportunity to know fellow class members.

17. The only weak point I detected was the small amount of time we had for our weekly seminar. I would have desired more time for all of us to discuss our classroom situations and offer suggestions on ways to improve and become better future teachers.

18. Not enough time in each class. Either daily or the length of time allotted by semester--five weeks in each school.

19. Some of the observer-participants were just observers. They did not get a chance to work closely with the students. They were doing work for the teacher. The observers should get a chance to present short regular lessons at least so that they can become exposed and overcome the grit of facing a class.

20. I feel we could do our student teaching in this class. However, we are so much more ahead with the experience we have gained. It is a great idea and needs to be broadened. I have read recently that future teachers will get more opportunity to work in the field than was formerly given. This will help separate those who are not sure if they should take up the profession and add to the experience of those who will.

21. Hardly any. I think in my case I got the maximum out of the non-classroom assignment in about two weeks and perhaps after that was marking time although I enjoyed my association with the people with whom I worked.

Utah Street School Project

The School - Of 1,400 pupils attending Utah, more than 97%, mostly Negro and Mexican-American, live in a low-income housing project which surrounds the school. Seventy-seven percent of the pupils are in the first three grades. There is high transiency. Results of tests measuring ability and achievement are disappointing and discouraging to teachers.

Planning - The principal of Utah School requested participation in the project. A professor from the School of Education was appointed to head the Utah project. The principal and college professor who was assigned to teach courses at Utah conferred with the superintendent of schools to establish basic agreements. The two then met with teachers to clarify purposes, approaches, organization, and methods.

Program - The program at Utah extended over a period of three semesters and involved two groups of students. During the first semester, an eight-unit block course, "Principles, Curriculum, and Methods of Teaching Elementary School," was conducted at Utah. The class met four days each week. An additional one and one-half days were devoted to observation-participation. During the second semester, participants did two student teaching assignments--one a primary and the second in upper grades. Throughout the year, special and extensive laboratory experiences were provided. These are outlined in Exhibit 1.

Personnel involved - Students were "recruited" from among those enrolling in basic credential courses. Special interviews and advisement were given applicants for the project. Forty-five students participated in the project and thirty-nine completed all phases of the program. Twenty-four regular classroom teachers were involved as well as specialists in reading, mathematics, special education and speech therapy.

Jefferson High School Project

The School - Jefferson High School is a senior high school with enrollment of about 2100 students. Of these, approximately ninety-eight percent are Negro. School facilities compare favorably with those of other high schools in the city. Over the years Jefferson has earned a commendable record in educating Negro youth. Still there exist many of the unique instructional problems ordinarily found in de facto segregated schools. Among these are problems related to motivation and the need to improve achievement in basic skills.

Planning - Administrators of the Division of Secondary Education, Los Angeles City Schools, designated Jefferson to participate in the pilot project. A professor from the School of Education at CSCLA was appointed to work with the principal. The two planned cooperatively with the high school staff and arrived at agreements concerning the job to be undertaken and the working relationships to be maintained.

Program - The pilot program at Jefferson extended over a period of two semesters. During the first semester, students spent two hours each day in a program that included instruction, observation, and participation in classrooms appropriate to their major and minor subject fields. Participation also extended into other aspects of the school's program. These are described in Exhibit 2. Students attended a weekly seminar which, in conjunction with their other activities, carried four units of college credit in fulfillment of a regular credential requirement.

Personnel Involved - A total of thirty students were involved in the project. Fifteen participated during the first semester and twenty-three (including some of the original fifteen) during the second. Approximately half of the students have completed all phases of the program, including student teaching. Approximately fifty faculty members were involved.

V. Evaluation of the project

No attempt was made to organize this program as a bona fide action research project. Nevertheless, complete accounts of the operations were kept, reactions of the students to the various experiences were gathered, and value judgments have been made by college instructors and public school personnel. A rather revealing evaluation of the project may be made from the following:

A. The number of students completing all phases of the projects was exceptionally high. They were enthusiastic about their experiences which they felt to be extremely broadening. Advantages of the program reported by students are listed in Exhibit 4.

B. A significant number of those participating in the project did accept employment in the "inner city" schools. There seems little doubt that similar programs will provide a larger number of better prepared teachers for the culturally disadvantaged.

C. Participation of their schools in the project did have positive effects upon the enthusiasm and morale of the classroom teachers who worked with the college students.

D. Administrators of the Los Angeles City Schools developed very positive attitudes towards the program and urged that it be extended.

E. The college instructors involved in the project feel that the experiences of the students had significantly more impact than under the ordinary credential curriculum.

F. The merits of the program are recognized so widely that an expanded version has become part of the regular credential offerings at California State College at Los Angeles.

EXHIBIT 1

Laboratory Experiences for Students in the Utah Project

1. **Observation-participation one and one-half school days each week, with each student being assigned to three levels of the curriculum.**
2. **Observation and/or participation in school-community related activities, such as the community council, compensatory educational activities, nursery school, day-care center, and well-baby clinic.**
3. **Conferences with parents, local police officials, director of the housing authority, city councilman, school counselor, adult education counselor, supervisor of new teachers, and principal.**
4. **Observation of special teachers of remedial reading, speech, mathematics, music, art, and hearing.**
5. **Observation of special demonstrations in classrooms of selected schools.**
6. **Pre-school orientation conferences with the Utah faculty and work with selected teachers as they prepared for the opening of school.**
7. **Student teaching in two assignments, one-half semester each. One assignment was at a lower and one at an upper grade level. Most students remained at the school six hours each day voluntarily.**

EXHIBIT 2

Laboratory Experiences for Students in the Jefferson Project

1. Service as assistants to regular classroom teachers in major and minor subject specialties for one hour daily throughout the semester.
2. Assigned time of one hour daily to service areas such as the attendance office, library, counselor's office, office of the nurse, or to co-curricular programs such as sports, assemblies, interest clubs, or student government.
3. Attendance at a weekly all-morning seminar taught by the college instructor.
4. Observation of and participation in special classes within the school, including those in reading, mathematics, and English.
5. Field trips to community agencies and to governmental departments giving service to Jefferson youth.
6.
    a. Avalon Community Center (Church and Community Chest supported)
    b. Newton Police Station (fine youth program)
    c. YMCA - 28th Street
    d. PTA Health Center - City Health Center
7. Student teaching in the student's major or minor subject fields or both, with the assignments extending over a period of one complete semester.
8. Participation in appropriate faculty conferences, teacher institutes, and regular staff meetings.
9. Field trips to contributing junior high schools.
10. Noontime supervision assignments at nearby elementary schools.
11. Guided tour of community.
12. Professional membership in National Education Association or one of its affiliated organizations.

EXHIBIT 3

Advantages of the "Jefferson Project" Identified by the Students Involved

1. **There were opportunities to work directly with high school students--individually and in groups.**
2. **There were opportunities to learn "how" by close observation and actual experience.**
3. **There was reduced over-lap in the subject matter of two required education courses.**
4. **One gained increased understanding and appreciation of the teacher's job in an economically disadvantaged area.**
5. **One received inspiration from dedicated faculty and administrators.**
6. **There was increased opportunity to move easily from the role of a student to that of a teacher.**
7. **Opportunities were provided to secure experience in the teacher's daily routines.**
8. **There existed close working relationship with college instructors, and school personnel was available to give advice and counsel.**
9. **There was adequate opportunity for explanation and interpretation of what goes on in a comprehensive secondary school.**
10. **The experiences dispelled fears concerning discipline and undesirable student behavior.**
11. **There were opportunities to view total school program in relation to pupil and community needs.**

APPENDIX E

REPORT TO AACTE - SEPTEMBER, 1965

The "Utah" and "Jefferson" Projects * of California State College, Los Angeles

California State College at Los Angeles conducts one of the state's major collegiate programs for preparation of teachers. Located in a cosmopolitan area, CSCLA uses a number of public schools attended by children of minority groups as laboratories. Students earning credentials serve in these schools as participating-observers and student teachers, and there is evidence that these programs provide some excellent teachers for the central area of Los Angeles City.

However, as in most urban areas, the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Schools faces critical problems in staffing the schools of the "inner city." Required are not only more teachers desiring to work with young people in low socio-economic areas but those with special skills and background for doing so.

Therefore, during the school year 1963-64, the School of Education, CSCLA, in cooperation with the Los Angeles City Schools organized an experimental program to meet better its professional responsibility towards this problem of public education. Though the pilot program was significant in scope, it was not submitted by special grants or extra funds. The program involved faculty of the School of Education and allied college disciplines, teachers and administrators of the Los Angeles City Schools, the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles City Schools, and students of CSCLA preparing both for elementary and secondary teaching credentials.

The description of this project and manner of its implementation constitute the case study submitted by California State College at Los Angeles in consideration for the AACTE Distinguished Achievement Awards, 1965.

I. Events leading to development of the project

In the fall of 1962, the Dean of the School of Education requested a review of the School's position in providing teachers for the culturally deprived. At meetings with administrators of the Los Angeles City Schools, critical problems faced in the recruitment, placement, and retention of teachers for the inner city were identified. The college was offered cooperation to implement any program designed to alleviate these difficulties.

In June 1963 designated faculty of the School of Education met with representatives of the Board of Trustees, Los Angeles City Schools, administrators of the city schools, and faculty representing the sociology and psychology departments at CSCLA. A commitment to a tentative plan was made. Shortly thereafter, those volunteering to participate made specific plans for a pilot program for the fall, 1963. An advisory committee representative of the participating agencies was established to assist in development and coordination of the program.

II. Objectives of the project

It was the intent to conduct a program of teacher preparation which, if encouraging, might become the pattern of an intensified effort to increase the number of new teachers for culturally disadvantaged youth. Closely allied was the desire to determine insofar as possible whether students provided special training experiences would be inclined to seek employment as teachers of the disadvantaged.

It was further expected that experiences with the project might point the way to desirable modification of the education curriculum for all students earning credentials at CSCLA.

Also desired was to determine what impact, if any, the presence of many participant-observers and student teachers would have upon the regular teaching faculty of the disadvantaged schools.

III. Considerations in designing the project

Arising from the desire to move into the project rapidly were several practical considerations. Inasmuch as no special or additional funds were available for either faculty or students, the incentives for those participating in the project were entirely personal. Because of the press of time, it was necessary to implement the project within boundaries of the existing curricular pattern rather than establish new courses or effect modification of existing credential requirements. Finally, it was necessary to staff the program within the framework of normal teaching loads and faculty requirements.

From the theoretical standpoint, it was felt that the project should possess certain characteristics. First, it should involve intensified laboratory experiences in schools populated almost entirely by educationally disadvantaged students. Second, special endeavor should be made to relate learning theory to the unique problems of teaching culturally deprived. Third, there should be unusual efforts by faculty and administrators of the laboratory schools to involve participating students in the total school program. Fourth, though there should be preliminary screening and advisement of students desiring to participate in the project, the group should represent a cross-section of regular credential candidates.

IV. Description of the Project

Within the framework described above, a two-phased pilot project was initiated in September 1963. One phase, the "Utah Street School Project," involved students preparing for elementary teaching. The second, the "Jefferson High School Project," involved those preparing for secondary school teaching.